NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Wednesday, November 13, 2002, 1:30 p.m.
Video Conference Sites:
Executive Building-Videoconference Room 103, 521 South 14th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska
Panhandle Station-High Plains Room, 4502 Avenue I, Scottsbluff, Nebraska
Kearney Public Library-Information Center, 2nd Floor, 2020 1st Avenue, Kearney, Nebraska
AGENDA

Meeting Documents:
Click the links in the agenda
or click here for all documents

1:30 P.M. Call to Order and Roll Call – Lt. Gov. Heineman

1:35 P.M. Notice of Meeting and Approval of September 16, 2002 minutes - Lt. Gov. Heineman

1:40 P.M. Public Comment

1:45 P.M. Report from the Councils, Technical Panel and Staff

A. Community Council
   1. Council Report
B. Education Council
   1. Council Report
C. State Government Council
   1. Council Report
D. Technical Panel
   1. Panel Report
   2. Standards and Guidelines
      a. **Secure E-mail for State Government Agencies***
      b. **Disaster Recovery Planning Procedures***
E. Staff Reports
   1. Action Items Update
   2. Digital State Survey Results 2002 (Refer to pp. 18-21 of NITC Biennial Report.)
   3. E-Government Initiatives

2:15 P.M. **Project Review and Prioritization***

2:45 P.M. **NITC Biennial Report***

3:00 P.M. NETCOM / CAP Activities

3:45 P.M. New Business

4:00 P.M. Adjournment

(Bolded * indicate Action Items.)

Meeting notice was posted to the NITC and Public Calendar Websites on November 6, 2002.
Agenda was posted to the NITC website on November 6, 2002.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Monday, September 16, 2002
Video Conference Sites:
Executive Building-Videoconference Room 103, 521 South 14th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska
Panhandle Station-High Plains Room, 4502 Avenue I, Scottsbluff, Nebraska
Kearney Public Library-Information Center, 2nd Floor, 2020 1st Avenue, Kearney, Nebraska
PROPOSED MEETING MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Lieutenant Governor Dave Heineman, Chair
Greg Adams, Mayor, City of York,
L. Merill Bryan, Senior Vice President & Chief Information Officer, Union Pacific
Dr. Doug Christensen, Commissioner, Department of Education
Dr. Eric Brown, Manager, KRVN Radio (in Kearney)
Trev Peterson, Attorney, Knudsen, Berkheimer, Richardson, and Endacott, LLP
Dr. L. Dennis Smith, President, University of Nebraska
Hod Kosman, CEO, Platte Valley Financial Services (in Scottsbluff)

CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, NOTICE OF MEETING

Lieutenant Governor Heineman called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. There were eight members present at the time of roll call. A quorum existed to conduct official business. It was announced that the meeting notice was posted to the NITC and Public Meeting Calendar Websites on September 4, 2002, and that the meeting agenda was posted to the NITC Web Site on September 10, 2002.

APPROVAL OF JUNE 18, 2002 MEETING MINUTES

Commissioner Smith moved to approve the June 18, 2002 meeting minutes as presented. Commissioner Peterson seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Adams-Yes, Brown-Yes, Bryan-Yes, Christensen-Yes, Heineman-Yes, Kosman-Yes, Peterson-Yes, and Smith-Yes. Motion was carried by unanimous vote.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chuck Friesen, Lincoln Public Schools, Director of Instructional Technology, provided the following public commentary:

> "TINA/WIDEN/NETCOM has spent a great deal of time and money. The Network Nebraska document is, to some degree, a revision of these previous efforts. There is currently a concern among Omaha and Lincoln K-12 institutions that the Network Nebraska document suggests eastern Nebraska will subsidize the network for western Nebraska. These concerns tend to argue against the building of a coalition that is necessary to make the Network Nebraska plan viable. The stated concerns among telcos that DOC can't build or hold a coalition together seems accurate when these concerns exist. Thus, there is an immediate need to get the key eastern Nebraska K-12 players on board. The backbone plan submitted by Walter Weir appears to jump start the Network Nebraska process. It has the ability to build consensus among those that have been slow to show support. The University is a trusted education-first institution whose needs much more closely approximate K -12 than do those of state government. (Internet 2, Blackboard, Online Learning, Learning Centers) We support an IP- centric network. We don't have concerns for such protocols as SNA or others since we have long since made the move to an IP-centric environment ourselves."

Dr. Friesen entertained questions and comments from the Commissioners. After discussion, Lieutenant Governor Heineman and Commissioners made the following comments:

- Postalization is not going to happen.
- Commissioners are confident that the coalition cohesiveness is intact and will remain intact.
- Commissioner Smith felt that University of Nebraska could assist the smaller school districts by using a combination of connections.
- Commissioner Christensen is concerned with the smaller schools where the need for telecommunications is greater and higher.

REPORT – COMMUNITY COUNCIL
Jeanne Saathoff, Co-chair and Anne Byers, Community Information Technology Manager

IT Planning and Mini Grant Program. In partnership with Technologies Across Nebraska, the Community Council will be working with eight communities to develop local information technology plans - Alliance; Brown/Keya Paha/Rock Counties; Crawford-Harrison; Custer County; Edgar; Fillmore County; West Point; and York County. (More detailed information available on Community Council link above.)

RUS Community Connect Broadband Grant Workshop. The Nebraska Information Technology Commission is co-sponsoring a workshop on preparing USDA Rural Utilities Service Community Connect Broadband Grant applications. The grant program provides funding for small, economically challenged communities to provide broadband access. The workshop will be broadcast to satellite downlink sites on Sept. 24 from 2:30 to 4:00 P.M. CT. Information on the workshop is available at http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/RUSworkshop.

Inventory and Gap Analysis Update. One of the Community Council's action items includes working with Technologies Across Nebraska to complete an inventory of IT-related programs and to conduct a gap analysis. In a preliminary gap analysis, members identified the following needs:

- There is a lack of motivated local leadership in many communities.
- There are few effective regulatory remedies for poor Internet service.
- There is a need for technical assistance in evaluating broadband technologies.
- Additional information on providing incentives for alternative service providers is needed.
- Information on new models of private-public partnerships need to be developed including sample cooperative agreements needs to be available.

(More detailed information available on Community Council link above.)

Lieutenant Governor Heineman commended Ms. Byers for her assistance with the conference sponsored by Congressman Tom Osborne.

REPORT – EDUCATION COUNCIL
Tom Rolfes, Education Information Technology Manager

The Education Council has had the opportunity to discuss and provide input regarding the Nebraska Network Report. On August 18th, the Education Council endorsed the Nebraska Network Draft Report. The governance models and determining the pros and cons for long-term management concerned the Council. Presentations conducted at the council meetings included the following:

- Nebrask@Online proposal for an Education Portal. The council endorsed the proposal and will provide input on the architecture and content. The project is a collaborative between NOL and the Office of the CIO/NITC. Mr. Rolfes has visited the web sites of other states and Nebraska could have the first web portal horizontal and vertical access to education information.
- Blackboard capabilities. Jim Zemke, from the University of Nebraska, was thanked for organizing the demonstration on August 16, 2002. Representatives from the University of Nebraska, K-12, community and state colleges were present.

NETC training grants were affected by the budget cuts. Dr. Christensen put forward a resolution at the NETC meeting to cover costs of existing projects. The council acknowledges the value of these grants for statewide training and would like to revive these monies when the state is in better economic shape.

Membership Changes. The Council has endorsed the following recommendations for new council members for final approval by the NITC:

- Higher Education-Dr. Jerry Moskus, Community College System, President, Metro Community College
- K-12 Education - Mr. Terry Haack, NE Council of School Administrators, Principal, Elkhorn High School

Commissioner Christensen moved to approve Dr. Jerry Moskus and Mr. Terry Haack has new Education Council members. Commissioner Smith seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Smith-Yes, Peterson-Yes, Kosman-Yes, Heineman-Yes, Christensen-Yes, Bryan-Yes, Brown-Yes, and Adams-Yes. Motion was carried by unanimous vote.

The Lieutenant Governor is interested in attending the September or October Education Council meeting. Mr. Rolfes will follow through on this request.

REPORT – STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL
Steve Schafer, Chief Information Officer

The council has met three times since the last NITC meeting. Electronic records retention has been a concern. The council has formed a work group to prioritize and address issues pertaining to electronic records retention. NOL is working with the

council to develop an employee portal. The E-government conference is scheduled for Thursday, September 16th, at the Cornhusker Hotel.

Membership Changes. On September 12th, the Council endorsed the following membership changes to the charter for final approval by the NITC:

- 6.1 - Number of Members was changed from 21 to 24 members
- 6.2 - Change wording from "Agency Directors" to "Agency Directors or Representatives"
- 6.2.9 Natural Resources Commission name changed to Department of Natural Resources

Additional Members to include:

- 6.2.10 - Department of Correctional Services
- 6.2.11 - Department of Environmental Quality
- 6.2.12 - Nebraska State Patrol

Commissioner Peterson moved to approve the State Government Council's recommended charter amendments. Commissioner Bryan seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Christensen-Yes, Heineman-Yes, Bryan-Yes, Kosman-Yes, Brown-Yes, Peterson-Yes, Adams-Yes, and Smith-Yes. Motion was carried by unanimous vote.

REPORT – TECHNICAL PANEL
Walter Weir, Chair

The Technical Panel has met three times since the last NITC meeting. Several presentations were given and include the following:

- Discussion of Distance Learning Interconnectivity with Al Schneider, Southeast Nebraska Distance Learning Consortium. The panel felt that the consortium was proposing a different standard than that established by the NITC. Mr. Schneider agreed to wait until the NITC's Network Nebraska report was adopted before suggesting other infrastructure projects.
- AET's Emergency Response Network Proposal - Dr. Vrbicky and Don LaPoint. Before accepting the proposal, the panel felt that a pilot project demonstrating their network would be beneficial.
- DTV Datacasting - Michael Beach

REPORT – STAFF
Steve Schafer, Chief Information Officer

Summaries of agencies' IT comprehensive agency plans have been posted on the NITC web site. A document with pie charts indicating state agency email accounts, email applications, productivity software and security policies was distributed. Commissioners were given the status of action items and Budget Review Timeline. LB 12 extended the budget deadline until October 15th.

NETCOM Update
Steve Schafer, Chief Information Officer

The Collaborative Aggregation Partnership has been working cooperatively towards accomplishing the Scottsbluff pilot. The project is days away from signing a Memorandum of Understanding with Qwest and Sprint to provide services.

Lieutenant Governor Heineman thanked Walter Weir, Commissioner Smith, Commissioner Christensen, and Lori McClurg, Director of Department of Administrative Services, for their efforts.

NETWORK NEBRASKA WORKGROUP FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Presenters entertained questions from the Commissioners, after the following three presentations were provided (for more detailed information, click on the link):

- Network Nebraska/NETCOM Update – Steve Schafer
- DTV Datacasting – Mike Beach
- NETCOM Phase I - Education Focus – Walter Weir

Commissioner Smith moved to adopt the Nebraska Network Workgroup Final Report and Recommendations. Commissioner Adams seconded the motion. The following friendly amendments were offered:

- Add the word "economical" to recommendation 1, and
- Change the wording of recommendation 3 to read, "The Nebraska Division of Communications should coordinate, in

close cooperation with the University of Nebraska, the telecommunications purchasing needs for the State." Commissioners Smith and Adams accepted the friendly amendments. **Roll call vote: Peterson-Yes, Brown-Yes, Smith-Yes, Adams-Yes, Kosman-Yes, Bryan-Yes, Heineman-Yes, and Christensen-Yes. Motion was carried by unanimous vote.**

The recommendations of the Nebraska Network Study are available at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/network/Documents/FinalReportRecommendations_September 16.pdf. The recommendations are located on pages 4-5.

Commissioners offered the following suggestions:

- Next steps be mapped out and/or include a flow chart with timelines.
- A governance proposal should be provided, including a statement regarding the need for a partnership with the telcos. Commissioner Christensen offered to draft a statement for the next meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

Commissioner Kosman referred to an article published in the Wall Street Journal regarding the a Supreme Court case dealing with telecommunications issues. The Lieutenant Governor agreed to distribute the article to the other commissioners.

NEXT MEETING AND ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission will be held on Wednesday, November 13, 2002 at 1:30 p.m. The location will be determined later. Commissioner Smith moved to adjourn. Commissioner Christensen seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion was carried by voice vote. The meeting was adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

Meeting minutes were taken by Lori Lopez Urdiales and reviewed by staff of the Office of the CIO/NITC.

November 5, 2002

To: NITC Commissioners

From: Anne Byers

Subject: Community Council Report

Technologies Across Nebraska Update. In partnership with Technologies Across Nebraska, the Community Council has begun working with eight communities to develop IT plans. The eight communities are Alliance; Brown Keya Paha/Rock Counties; Crawford-Harrison; Custer County; Edgar; Fillmore County; West Point; and York County. Introductory meetings have been held with six of the eight communities. Most of the communities are in the process of conducting a community assessment using the Community Information Technology Planning and Assessment Workbook (http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/toolkit/workbook). Members of one community technology committee requested a sample plan. In response to their suggestion, a sample plan was developed and placed on the Community IT Toolkit site as well as links to actual plans developed by other communities.

The last Technologies Across Nebraska meeting was held on October 31 and focused on e-government. The University of Nebraska Extension will begin offering classes on e-government for local government officials.

As Technologies Across Nebraska becomes a more action-oriented organization, the Technologies Across Nebraska action plan will be updated.

Nebraska Universal Service Fund Update. The Nebraska Public Service Commission will hold a hearing on November 6 on the use of Nebraska Universal Service Funds to support telehealth. The Nebraska Hospital Association and the Nebraska Telehealth Development Group have filed testimony. Through its monthly meetings, the Community Council Subcommittee on Telehealth has facilitated discussions among health care providers on this issue.

New Report on IT Training Needs of Midwest Businesses. The AIM Institute and six Midwestern community colleges have studied the IT training needs of firms in the region. The findings are analyzed in three reports available from the AIM Web site (www.aimlink.org). The study found that the five training areas rated most important by Midwest businesses are telecommunications; data; e-commerce; client server; and human factor engineering. The professional development topics ranked most important are WAN/LAN; TCP/IP; VPN; wireless; project management (PPM); security (SANS/CISSP); disaster planning and recovery; and SQL.

Title	**Secure E-mail for State Government Agencies**
Category	**Groupware Architecture**
Applicability	**State Government Agencies** (See the "Applicability" section below.)
Status	☐ **Standard** - A degree or level of requirement that all jurisdictions should use, which would be enforceable by duly authorized entities. With any standard, there may be circumstances that merit exceptions. ☑ **Guideline -** A statement of general policy or procedure by which to determine a course of action. Adherence is voluntary.
Date Adopted	**DRAFT**
Date of Last Revision	**August 8, 2002**
Date of Next Review	**June 2004**

A. Authority

Section 86-516 (6). "[The Nebraska Information Technology Commission shall] adopt minimum technical standards, guidelines, and architectures upon recommendation by the technical panel."

B. Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this guideline is to provide state government agencies a suggested technical solution for sending and receiving e-mail and electronic documents that require secure transmission.

Some agencies that handle sensitive information may need to securely transmit such information electronically. E-mail messages and documents sent over the Internet are generally sent in a non-secure format; however, there are various methods available to secure e-mail messages and electronic documents. This guideline recommends one method for use by state government agencies, but does not preclude an agency from using another method.

IMServices is developing a secure, Web-based document transmission system for Health and Human Services. The system, known as Secure Information Xchange (SIX), is expected to be operational by January 2003, and has been designed to allow other agencies to utilize this secure method of document transmission.

The Technical Panel will periodically review this guideline and the technical solution chosen to ensure it continues to meet the needs of state agencies.

C. Guideline

State agencies needing to send or receive secure electronic communications should consider utilizing the Secure Information Xchange system, the Web-based document transmission system maintained and hosted by IMServices. Agencies are encouraged to contact IMServices for more information.

Agencies utilizing a secure, electronic communications system should develop policies for the use of such a system within their agency.

D. Key Definitions

Secure E-mail means a system for sending electronic messages and attached documents over a computer network in a manner in which the message and attached documents are protected from unauthorized access.

E. Applicability

State Government Agencies - Agencies needing secure e-mail and electronic document transmission are encouraged to utilize the Secure Information Xchange system maintained and hosted by IMServices.

F. Responsibility

G. Related Policies, Standards and Guidelines

(http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/)
E-mail Standards for State Agencies
Security Policies

Title	**Disaster Planning Procedures for Information Technology**
Category	**Security Architecture**
Applicability	**All Public Entities** (See the "Applicability" section below.)
Status	☐ **Standard** - A degree or level of requirement that all jurisdictions should use, which would be enforceable by duly authorized entities. With any standard, there may be circumstances that merit exceptions. ☑ **Guideline** - A statement of general policy or procedure by which to determine a course of action. Adherence is voluntary.
Date Adopted	**DRAFT (October 2, 2002)**
Date of Last Revision	
Date of Next Review	

A. Authority

Section 86-516 (6). "[The Nebraska Information Technology Commission shall] adopt minimum technical standards, guidelines, and architectures upon recommendation by the technical panel."

The Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC) has adopted a security policy pertaining to disaster recovery, which states that:

> "Each agency must have a disaster recovery plan that at least identifies and mitigates against risks to critical systems and sensitive information in the event of a disaster. The plan shall provide for contingencies to restore information and systems if a disaster occurs. The disaster recovery plan for information technology may be a subset of an agency's comprehensive disaster recovery plan. The concept of a disaster recovery includes business resumption." (http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/index.html)

B. Purpose and Objectives

Information technology (IT) and automated information systems are vital elements in most business processes. Because these IT resources are so essential to an organization's success, it is critical that the services provided by these systems are able to operate effectively without excessive interruption. Contingency planning supports this requirement by establishing thorough plans, procedures, and technical measures that can enable a system to be recovered quickly and effectively following a service disruption or disaster. Interim measures may include the relocation of IT systems and operations to an alternate site, the recovery of IT functions using alternate equipment, or the performance of IT functions using manual methods.

This template provides instructions, recommendations, and considerations for Nebraska State Government IT contingency planning. It discusses essential contingency plan elements and processes, highlights specific considerations and concerns associated with contingency planning for various types of IT systems, and provides examples to assist readers in developing their own IT contingency plans. The scope ranges from minor incidents causing short-term disruptions to disasters that affect normal operations for an extended period. Because IT systems vary in design and application, specific incident types and associated contingency measures are not provided in this document. Instead, the planning guide defines

a process that may be followed for any IT system to identify planning requirements and develop an effective contingency plan.

C. Assumptions

Following is a list of typical planning assumptions to be considered in writing the disaster recovery plan. Each agency must review and modify this list to meet their specific requirements. In particular, this list of assumptions does not entail certain worst-case scenarios, such as losing staff that would perform critical functions in exercising the disaster recovery plan.

1. The IT business continuity plan is part of a bigger plan that covers areas outside of IT (i.e., facilities, personnel, etc). The Nebraska Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) is currently revising the State Emergency Operations Plan (SEOP). Changes to the SEOP may provide state and local government with guidance on preparing business continuity plans that address internal operations and the ability to provide public services following a disaster. The relationship between the IT business continuity plan and the overall agency business continuity plan includes the following points:
    - The IT business continuity plan is a subset of the agency's overall business continuity plan.
    - Internal and external dependencies will be listed in the IT business continuity plan.
    - The IT business continuity plan will address internal dependencies, and the agency's overall business continuity plan will address external dependencies.
2. The plan will be approved and endorsed by management.
3. The plan will only cover critical information systems in the order of the highest priority. It will not cover every information system within an organization.
4. Staff is available to perform critical functions defined within the plan.
5. Staff can be notified and can report to the backup site(s) to perform critical processing, recovery and reconstruction activities.
6. Off-site storage facilities and materials will survive.
7. The disaster recovery plan is current.
8. Subsets of the overall plan can be used to recover from minor interruptions.
9. An alternate facility is available.
10. The necessary utilities (i.e., long distance and local communications lines, Wide Area Network and Internet connectivity, power, etc.) are available to the organization as defined in the dependencies section of the plan.
11. Outside organizations, including vendors will perform according to their general commitments to support the organization in a disaster.
12. Development, test, and implementation of new technologies and applications will be suspended during the disaster so that all resources will be available to the recovery.
13. Other assumptions.

D. IT Contingency Planning Process

To develop and maintain an effective IT contingency plan, organizations should use the following approach in the sequence shown:

1. *Develop the contingency planning policy statement.*
   A formal policy provides the authority and guidance necessary to develop an effective contingency plan. The Security Architecture Work Group (a Work Group sponsored by the Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission) developed the

state's Disaster Recovery Policy:
http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/tp/workgroups/security/security_policies.htm.

2. *Conduct the business impact analysis (BIA) and risk analysis (RA).*
The BIA helps to identify and prioritize critical IT systems and components. It's purpose is to correlate specific system components with the critical services that they provide, and based on that information, to characterize the consequences of a disruption to the system components. Key steps include listing critical IT resources, identifying disruption impacts and allowable outage times, and developing recovery priorities.

   When working on the BIA phase of the IT continuity plan, there are two goals to keep in mind for each business process: the recovery time objective (RTO) and the recovery point objective (RPO). RTO defines the tolerable maximum length of time that a business process can be unavailable, while RPO defines how much work in progress can be lost.

   The BIA and risk assessment procedures are documented in Chapter 3 of the Security Officer Instruction Guide (http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/tp/workgroups/security/documents.htm). Business continuity coordinators should reference that document for information on conducting an BIA. NIST SP 800-34 contains a sample BIA process and template that may also be used.

   Having determined the impacts, it is now important to consider the magnitude and likelihood of risks. Again, this is a critical activity - it will determine which scenarios are most likely to occur and which should attract most attention during continuity planning. This should include both partial and total system loss as well as least and worst case scenarios. Assessing the probability of an event and the likely loss should it occur associated with specific disaster scenarios helps determine appropriate and cost-effective preventive controls and recovery strategies.

3. *Identify preventive controls.*
In some cases, the outage impacts identified in the BIA may be mitigated or eliminated through preventive measures that deter, detect, and/or reduce impacts to the system. Where feasible and cost-effective, preventive methods are preferable to actions that may be necessary to recover the system after a disruption. Preventive controls should be documented in the contingency plan, and personnel associated with the system should be trained on how and when to use the controls. Adequate insurance coverage is one means to mitigate the financial impact of a disaster.

   Business continuity coordinators should list all preventive controls.

4. *Develop recovery strategies.*
Recovery strategies provide a means to restore IT operations quickly and effectively following a service disruption. Strategies should address disruption impacts and allowable outage times identified in the BIA. Several alternatives should be considered when developing the strategy, including cost, allowable outage time, security, and integration with larger, organization-level contingency plans. These strategies should be prioritized, based on the scenarios developed in the risk analysis phase.

   The selected recovery strategy should address the potential impacts identified in the BIA/RA and should be integrated into the system architecture during the design and implementation phases of the system life cycle. It should include a combination of methods that complement one another to provide recovery capability over the full spectrum of incidents. A wide variety of recovery approaches may be considered; the

appropriate choice depends on the incident, type of system, budget resources and its operational requirements as determined in the previous phases.

Assumptions and dependencies should be identified as part of the recovery strategy. These are areas beyond the scope of control of the planners.

5. *Format an IT Contingency Plan.*
IT contingency plan development is a critical step in the process of implementing a comprehensive contingency planning program. The plan contains detailed roles, responsibilities, teams, and procedures associated with restoring an IT system following a disruption. The contingency plan should document technical capabilities designed to support contingency operations. Each organization must tailor the contingency plan and its requirements to fit their needs. Plans need to balance detail with flexibility; usually the more detailed the plan, the less scalable and versatile the approach.

   The contingency plan comprises five main components:
   - Supporting Information
   - Notification/Activation Phase
   - Recovery Phase
   - Reconstitution Phase
   - Plan Appendices

   See Section IV for more details.

6. *Plan Testing, Training, and Exercises.*
Each IT contingency plan element should be tested to confirm the accuracy of individual recovery procedures and the overall effectiveness of the plan. Testing enables plan deficiencies to be identified and addressed. Testing also helps evaluate the ability of the recovery staff to implement the plan quickly and effectively.

   The ideal disaster test scenario uses a true-to-life model that draws participants into the exercise and allows them to test their procedures realistically. The test scenario may be at any level from a single system to an entire enterprise being affected. Planners should use explicit test objectives and success criteria in their test plan in order to assess the effectiveness of each plan element and the overall plan. Information collected during the test and post-test reviews that improve plan effectiveness should be incorporated into the contingency plan.

7. *Plan Maintenance.*
To be effective, the plan must be maintained in a ready state that accurately reflects system requirements, procedures, organizational structure, and policies. IT systems undergo frequent changes because of shifting business needs, technology upgrades, or new internal or external policies. Therefore, it is essential that the contingency plan be reviewed and updated regularly, as part of the organization's change management process, to ensure new information is documented and contingency measures are revised if required. Responsibility for plan currency must be assigned as part of critical job duties. As a general rule, the plan should be reviewed for accuracy and completeness at least annually or whenever significant changes occur to any element of the plan. Certain elements will require more frequent reviews, such as contact lists. Based on the system type and criticality, it may be reasonable to evaluate plan contents and procedures more frequently.

   The business continuity plan should be stored away from the organization’s primary facility. Records management has the ability to store these documents in their repository; however, they take no responsibility for the documents.

E. Contingency Plan Development

This section discusses the key elements that comprise the contingency plan. The plan contains detailed roles, responsibilities, teams, and procedures associated with restoring an IT system following a disruption. It should be tailored to each department or agency.

1. *Supporting Information*
   The Supporting Information component includes an introduction and concept of operations section that provides essential background or contextual information that makes the contingency plan easier to understand, implement, and maintain. These details aid in understanding the applicability of the guidance, in making decisions on how to use the plan, and in providing information on where associated plans and information outside the scope of the plan may be found.
   a) Introduction Section
   This section orients the reader to the type and location of information contained in the plan. It contains the following subsections:
      i) Purpose
      ii) Applicability
      iii) Scope
         (1) Scenarios
         (2) Assumptions
         (3) Dependencies
      iv) References/requirements
      v) Record of Changes

   b) Concept of Operations
   This section provides additional details about the IT system, the contingency planning framework; and response, recovery, and resumption activities. This section may include the following elements:
      i) System Description
      ii) Line of Succession
      iii) Responsibilities
      iv) External Communications

2. *Notification/Activation Phase*
   The Notification/Activation Phase defines the initial actions taken once a system disruption or emergency has been detected or appears to be imminent. This phase includes activities to notify both management and recovery personnel, assess system damage, and implement the plan. Notification/Activation must match the overall organizational recovery plan. At the completion of the Notification/Activation Phase, recovery staff will be prepared to perform contingency measures to restore system functions on a temporary basis.

3. *Recovery Phase*
   The Recovery Phase begins after the contingency plan has been activated, damage assessment has been completed (if possible), personnel have been notified, and appropriate teams have been mobilized. Recovery phase activities focus on contingency measures to execute temporary IT processing capabilities, repair damage to the original system, and restore operational capabilities at the original or new facility. At the completion of the Recovery Phase, the IT system will be operational and performing the functions designated in the plan. Depending on the recovery strategies defined in the plan, these functions could include temporary manual processing, recovery and operation on an alternate system, or relocation and recovery at an alternate site. Teams with

recovery responsibilities should understand and be able to perform these recovery strategies well enough that if the paper plan is unavailable during the initial stages of the event, they can still perform the necessary activities.

4. *Reconstitution Phase*
   In the Reconstitution Phase, recovery activities are terminated, and normal operations are transferred back to the organization's facility. If the original facility is unrecoverable, the activities in this phase can also be applied to preparing a new facility to support system processing requirements. Once the original or new site is restored to the level that it can support the IT system and its normal processes, the system may be transitioned back to the original or to the new site. Until the primary system is restored and tested, the contingency system should continue to be operated. The Reconstitution Phase should specify teams responsible for restoring or replacing both the site and the IT system.

5. *After Action Review*
   An After Action Review (AAR) is an assessment conducted after the business continuity activity (i.e., disaster, test, etc.) that allows employees and leaders to discover what happened and why. It may be thought of as a professional discussion of an event that enables employees to understand why things happened during the progression of the process and to learn from that experience. The AAR is an essential element to complete the four-step planning cycle of review, update, modify, and plan.

6. *Contingency Plan Appendices*
   Contingency Plan Appendices provide key details not contained in the main body of the plan. The appendices should reflect the specific technical, operational, and management contingency requirements of the given system. Appendices can include, but are not limited to contact information for contingency planning team personnel; vendor contact information, including offsite storage and alternate site POCs; standard operating procedures and checklists for system recovery or processes; equipment and system requirements lists of the hardware, software, firmware, and other resources required to support system operations; vendor agreements, reciprocal agreements with other organizations, and other vital records; description of, and directions to, the alternate site; and the BIA.

F. Applicability

The issue of disaster recovery planning for information technology applies to any agency or institution that relies on information technology to support critical business functions. Agencies or institutions should follow a structured methodology, such as these guidelines, in developing a disaster recovery plan for information technology.

G. Responsibility

1. Nebraska Emergency Management Agency (NEMA). NEMA is responsible for preparing and maintaining the State Emergency Operations Plan. One element of this plan pertains to continuity of government operations. Disaster planning procedures for information technology is a subset of continuity of government operations.
2. State Records Management Division, Secretary of State's Office. The Records Management Division serves as a repository for back-up media. The Records Management Division will also store electronic and paper copies of an agencies disaster recovery plan.

3. Agency and Institutional Heads. The highest authority within an agency or institution is responsible for the protection of information resources, including developing and implementing information security programs, including disaster recovery plans for information technology. The authority may delegate this responsibility but delegation does not remove the accountability.
4. Agency Information Officer. In most cases, the highest authority within an agency or institution delegates the general responsibility for security of the agency's information technology resources to the agency's highest-ranking information technology professional. This responsibility includes development and promulgation of agency-specific information security policies, including disaster recovery planning for information technology.
5. Agency Security Officer. In some cases, the Agency Information Officer assigns an Agency Security Officer who is responsible for preparing a disaster recovery plan for information technology. They must understand the risks posed by disruption of computer systems. They must help prepare contingencies and be ready to implement the disaster recovery plan for information technology.

H. Related Standards and Guidelines

1. NITC Disaster Recovery Policy (http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/tp/workgroups/security/security_policies.htm)
2. NITC Security Officer Handbook (http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/security/so_guide.doc)
3. Nebraska Emergency Management Agency – Information Paper on Continuity of Operations Plan (available from NEMA at 402.471.7430)

I. References

1. NIST SP 800-34, Contingency Planning Guide for Information Technology Systems, http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/drafts/ITcontingency-planning-guidelines.pdf
2. Business Continuity Planning & Management on-line, http://www.contingencyplanning.com/
3. Disaster Recovery Journal, http://www.drj.com/
4. Contingency Planning and Disaster Recovery, http://www.disasterplan.com/
5. Kansas, Department of Administration, Contingency Planning On-Line, http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/drafts/ITcontingency-planning-guideline.pdf
6. FEDERAL EXECUTIVE BRANCH CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS (COOP), http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/pdd/fpc-65.htm

J. Additional Information For State Agencies

1. Insurance Coverage. State agencies should consider insurance coverage to mitigate the financial impact of a disaster. The Risk Management Division of the Department of Administrative Services offers two types of insurance coverage. Content insurance applies to fixtures and equipment within a building. Current cost is $.05 per $100 value, with a $5,000 deductible per event. Inland Marine Insurance covers non-permanent fixtures that are highly portable, such as laptops. The cost is $.12 to $.15 per $100 value. When calculating the value of equipment to be covered, agencies should include the cost of any services that might be used to restore services. Insurance should not be used instead of good disaster planning and mitigation strategies.

The Risk Management Division is working with the state's insurance broker to narrow the current exclusion of "terrorism". The state's insurance contracts provide some assistance with conducting risk assessments. The state's insurance broker also offers business continuity planning services for a fee.

2. Personnel issues. Agencies should be aware of labor contract requirements when developing their disaster recovery plans. The labor contract may affect options regarding leave time when the work site is not available, ability to work at an alternate site, working from home, and other issues. Counseling is available through the state's employee assistance program contract. Temporary staff is available through State Personnel's SOS program and IMServices' contractual services agreements.

3. Purchasing Issues. The Materiel Division can assist agencies with replacing equipment. Surplus Property is one option to consider. Existing contracts facilitate acquiring equipment, without the need for bids. The contract with IBM obligates the vendor to give priority and expedite shipment in the event of a disaster. Similar terms are being negotiated with Dell. Agencies should maintain complete equipment lists, including current configurations.

4. Information Management Services Division. IMServices houses much of the state's data and applications either on the mainframe or LAN servers located in the 501 Building. As custodians of this equipment and information, IMServices has its own disaster recovery plans to protect those assets. Agency information technology disaster recovery plans are simplified when IMServices manages the hardware, software and data resources, but agencies should include references and communications with IMServices regarding expectations for how much and how fast their applications and data functions need to be restored. Procurement of replacement LAN servers housed in 501 but owned by an agency are the responsibility of the agency. IMServices provides and manages backup services for mainframes, LAN servers at the 501 Building, and agency-owned servers that may be located anywhere on the campus LAN. Backup tapes (and the Gator backup System) are housed in the Capitol Computing Center and will be available for business resumption once the platform and/or network are restored.

   A Business Impact Analysis process to aid in applying the appropriate level of planning and investment against loss of IT assets and capability is contained in the Security Officer Guide developed by the NITC (http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/security/so_guide.doc).

5. Communications. The Division of Communications (DOC) is currently involved in a feasibility study in conjunction with IMS to determine if the existing core routing equipment can be duplicated off site, or split between two sites. DOC carries a limited amount of spare equipment that can be used at disaster sites, and we require our main vendors (Qwest and Alltel) to carry a certain number of spares. Although we do not have a formal agreement with the telcos, we expect to receive priority service from the telcos in the event of an emergency. DOC also has caches of cellular phones located at strategic positions about the State that can be quickly activated and distributed. DOC also assists agencies, such as NEMA, for coordinating radio communications when needed.

Status Summary of Council Action Items (FY 2003)
(Date of Last Revision: November 4, 2002)

Priority	Description	Lead	Planned Start	Planned Finish	Revised Finish	Comments
	Administrative					
	Agency Tech Plans – review and summaries	Rick / Jen	7/1/02	8/31/02		Done – 9/1/2002
	Budget Request for FY2004 / FY2005 Biennium	Steve / Lori	8/8/02	9/1/02		Done – 10/11/2002
	Clearinghouse Maintenance	All	Ongoing			
	Community Technology Grant Management	Anne	Ongoing			
	Coordinate with Other Groups (GIS, CJIS, DAS)	Steve	Ongoing			
	Digital States Survey	Rick / Steve	6/1/02	6/28/02		Done – 7/2/2002
	Government Tech Collaboration Grant Management	Rick	Ongoing			
	NIS Oversight	Steve	Ongoing			
	NITC.news	All	Ongoing			
	Project Status Reports – semiannual summary	Steve / Jen	1/15/03	1/30/03		
	Reports to the Legislature 1. Prioritized list of projects (Section 86-516) 2. Biennial Progress Report (Section 86-518) 3. Annual Report on ITIF Fund (Section 86-528)	All	 9/15/02 9/15/02 12/15/02	 11/15/02 11/15/02 1/15/03		 SGC review – 11/5 Draft report is complete
	Community Council					
CC 1.1	Technologies Across Nebraska Action Plan					
CC 1.1.1	Prepare inventory of information and Resources	Anne	Mar-02	8/30/02		Done
CC 1.1.2	Prepare a gap analysis of information and resources	Anne	Jul 02	8/30/02		Draft is done; further work pending comments from communities
CC 1.1.3	Promote information exchange and mentoring among community IT committees (e.g., e-mail lists)	Anne	Ongoing			
CC 1.1.4	Pilot toolkit with 8 communities (mini-grant recipients)	Anne	Jun 02	May 03		Meeting with 8 selected communities (out of 26 applications)
CC 1.1.5	Develop regional resource teams & regional meetings	Anne	Sep 02	10/31/02		Selective approach – where needed

CC 1.1.6	Plan regional forums	Anne	TBD			Columbus e-commerce forum 8/29; RUS Grant Workshop 9/24
CC 2.1	Telehealth Vision and Strategy		On hold			
CC 3.1	Local Government Toolkit Resources	Anne	Jan 03	May 03		
	Education Council					
	Education Portal	Tom	TBA	Jan 2003		Draft Education Portal Architecture presented to Education Council by NOL on 8/16. Agenda item for 11/15.
EC 1.1	Statewide Synchronous Video Network Implementation Plan	Tom	Jul-02	Dec-02	June - 03	
EC 1.2	Adequate Rural Bandwidth for Education	Tom	Apr-02	Dec-02	June – 03	
EC 2.1	Recommend Change in Funding for Technology Training Grants			11/15/02		Pursuant to LB 2, NETC terminated funding for technology training grants.
EC 3.1	Life Cycle funding Strategies and Total Cost of Ownership Materials		Oct-02	Mar-03		
EC 4.1	Role of Technology in Standards	Tom	Ongoing			
EC 4.2	Educational Technology Proficiency Measures	Tom	Ongoing			
EC 6.1	Synchronous and Asynchronous Instructional Methods	Tom	Apr-02	Jun-03		U of N demonstration of BlackBoard 5 – Level 3 Course Management Tools Implementation on 8/16/2002.
	State Government Council					
SGC 1.1	E-Government to Business Initiative	Steve / Rick	Ongoing			Signed MOU with NOL
SGC 1.2	E-Government to Employee Initiative	Rick	Jul 02	Sep-02	Dec – 02	Proposal on September SGC agenda
SGC 1.3	E-Government to Citizen Initiative	Steve / Rick	Oct 02	Dec-02		Signed MOU with NOL
SGC 2.1	Recommend Technical Standards, Guidelines & Enterprise Solutions 1. Secure e-mail 2. Use of Fax Servers	Rick	Ongoing	8/31/02	Nov – 02	On NITC agenda
SGC 3.1	Improved Planning Process	Steve / Rick	Apr 03	Jun-03		
SGC 3.2	Improved Project Management	Steve	Apr 03	Jun-03		
SGC 3.3	Communications with Policy Makers		Ongoing			
SGC 4.1	Security Policies	See Tech Panel				

SGC 4.2	Records Retention Project	Rick	Jul 02	Dec-02		Topic on July, August and Sept agendas.
	Technical Panel					
TP 1.1	Provide Technical Support to the NETCOM Project	Brenda Decker				
TP 1.2	Nebraska Telecommunications Infrastructure Review	Steve	Sep-02	Dec-02		
TP 1.3	Identify Types and Levels of Service	Brenda Decker				
TP 2.1	Recommend Technical Standards, Guidelines and Best Practices		Ongoing			
TP 2.1.1	Security Workgroup – Disaster Planning Guidelines	Steve	6/3/02	8/15/02	Nov – 02	On NITC Agenda
TP 2.2	Coordination of Networks (Nebraska Network Study) 1. Network Architecture Work Group 2. Statewide synchronous video implementation plan	Steve	Feb 02 Ongoing	9/31/02		Done. NITC adopted final report on 9/16.
TP 2.3	Implementation of Critical Elements of the Technical Architecture		Pending			
TP 3.1	Project Reviews (Statutory)		Sep 02	11/15/02		
TP 3.2	Project Reviews (Other)		Ongoing			
TP 3.3	Revise Procedures for Reviewing IT Purchases by State Agencies		Nov 02	Feb 03		

Agency Information Technology Projects
FY2003-05 Biennial Budget

November 2002

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
State Government Council Recommendation
FY2003-05 Information Technology Project Proposals

	Project #	Agency - # (Agency Priority Order)	Project Title	FY2003-04	FY2004-05	Score
1	25-07	Health and Human Services System ("HHSS") - 1	HIPAA Project	$ 11,658,540.00	$ 12,001,680.00	84
2	47-01	Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission ("NET") - 1	KLNE-TV NTSC Replacement Transmitter	$ 650,000.00		90
3	47-02	NET - 2	KMNE-TV NTSC Replacement Transmitter		$ 650,000.00	90
4	78-01	Crime Commission	CJIS - Criminal Justice Integration and Automation	$ 1,020,112.00	$ 790,112.00	88
5	21-01	State Fire Marshal	FLST Web-Based Application - Phase II	$ 20,000.00		84
6	25-01	HHSS - 3	Convert Lincoln NSOB to Ethernet Topology	$ 517,750.00	$ 517,750.00	81
7	37-01	Workers Compensation Court	Extended Computer Automation Project	$ 326,000.00	$ 24,000.00	80
8	25-04	HHSS - 2	Computer Hardware Renewal Policy and Program	$ 4,646,400.00	$ 4,646,400.00	79
9	47-03	NET - 3	Phone System Replacement / Switch Upgrade		$ 198,000.00	79
10	25-03	HHSS - 4	Desktop Operating System Replacement	$ 589,500.00	$ 783,300.00	67
11	25-02	HHSS - 5	Server Operating System Replacement	$ 130,375.00	$ 130,375.00	75
12	25-06	HHSS - 6	CHARTS Project*	$ 18,438,430.00	$ 18,896,388.00	73
13	25-08	HHSS - 7	NFOCUS Project*	$ 12,989,315.00	$ 13,343,217.00	78
14	25-05	HHSS - 8	Help Desk Call Tracking System	$ 75,000.00		83

* See Project Proposal for budget details

STAFF COMMENT: The recommendations of the State Government Council are primarily based on the review scores. The two exceptions are: 1) the HIPAA Project (#25-07) was moved to the top of the list because it is a new project mandated by the federal government with major consequences for noncompliance and 2) some of the HHSS projects were reordered to reflect the agency's priorities.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Biennial Budget - FY2003-05

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 21-01

Agency	Project	FY2003-04	FY2004-05
State Fire Marshal	FLST Web-Based Application - Phase II	$20,000	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This proposed project is to complete the items that were not finished in the FLST application during the last budget cycle (security, inspections, reporting, permit printing). These were not completed due to a low estimate and misunderstandings between IMS and this agency of the requirements for the application. As a result we ran out of money to complete the application as planned. Some minor modifications to a few existing components also need to be made during this phase. We cannot fully implement the application without these components, particularly security and reporting, being added to the application.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2003-04 (Year 1)	Total
2. Contractual Services			
2.1 Design	$ 15,500.00	$ 5,600.00	$ 21,100.00
2.2 Programming	$ 55,097.00	$ 14,400.00	$ 69,497.00
TOTAL COSTS	$ 70,597.00	$ 20,000.00	$ 90,597.00
General Funds			$ -
Cash Funds	$ 70,597.00	$ 20,000.00	$ 90,597.00
Federal Funds			$ -
Revolving Funds			$ -
Other Funds			$ -
TOTAL FUNDS	$ 70,597.00	$ 20,000.00	$ 90,597.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	11	12	12.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	24	20	21	21.7	25
V: Technical Impact	19	18	18	18.3	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	7	7	7.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	8	9	7	8.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	17	15	17	16.3	20
			TOTAL	**84**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer 1:
Strengths

- Good explanation of alternatives.

Weaknesses

- No real explanation of the stakeholders and has shown / will show acceptance by them.
- Phase 2 is a result of "a low estimate and misunderstandings between IMS and this agency" of Phase 1. I'm not sure how much confidence I have in the budget.

Reviewer 2:
Strengths

- Objectives are consistent with an e-government project, and measurement methods should provide a good indication of whether the project is having the desired impact.
- The business need and the rationale for dismissal of the alternative solution are adequately stated.
- The statements regarding the technical need for the project and adherence to standards are clear.
- Outline seems generally complete
- Risks are well-stated

Weaknesses

- There is no actual explanation of the project, although it seems to be the continuation of a project previously undertaken. Presumably the explanation is contained in the previous project proposal.
- There is no indication the agency considered NOL services as an alternative, but given that a large portion of the project is for the benefit of agency employees and other agencies, that option could be reasonably dismissed.
- Detail on tasks and timelines is lacking
- Not really a weakness in the application, but communication (or lack thereof) appears to be the primary risk.
- The budget summary provides little detail that can be used to assess reasonableness of cost.

Reviewer 3:
Strengths

- This Proposal supports e-Government goals.
- Will allow people outside Lincoln to have access to the data. Also, sponsor will be able to generate many of their reports themselves. These are intangibles that are difficult to put a dollar amount on them.
- The approach uses good current technical solutions.
- The sponsor did identify, in appropriate detail, the tasks and milestones to accomplish the project.
- The sponsor appears to understand some of the more common reasons that projects can be at risk. They have been through a project already, so they have experience.
- This project is not a high cost item, compared to many other agency projects.

Weaknesses

- Not sure how they will get "better data".
- Did not see tangible dollars identified (only a description of the benefit).
- No specific timeline has been established, but is estimated to take about 6 months. Not sure what approach was used to determine this duration.
- The sponsor did not state specifically how they were going to ensure better communication and monitor the project more closely.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Biennial Budget - FY2003-05

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 25-01

Agency	Project	FY2003-04	FY2004-05
HHSS	Convert Lincoln NSOB to Ethernet Topology	$517,750	$517,750

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project proposes to replace the Token Ring network topology used by HHSS (Health and Human Services System) in the NSOB (Nebraska State Office Building in Lincoln) with Ethernet. Ethernet is the leading network topology in use today and, as such, benefits from technological advancements in reliability, scalability and cost containment. Existing Token Ring equipment has exceeded its technical life expectancy (in use since the 1970s) and we are seeing a high rate of failure. Replacement parts are getting scarce making them very expensive. Technically skilled people required to maintain the Token Ring environment are much harder to find.

This project also addresses data cabling issues. The data cabling in place no longer meets approved standards and cannot support today's higher data transmission rates required by increased utilization and newer applications. Existing data cabling needs to be replaced according to guidelines and specifications from the Department of Administrative Services, Division of Communications.

This project supports the Agency's staff and ultimate mission of helping people live better lives through **effective** health and human services. The availability of reliable, scalable data network services is essential to the 935 staff from Finance & Support, Health & Human Services and Regulation & Licensure performing their job in the NSOB.

This project also supports the NITC (Nebraska Information Technology Commission) goal of coordinating investment in telecommunications infrastructure so as to aggregate demand, reduce costs and create support networks. The Division of Communications (DOC) and Information Management Services (IMS) have been asked to provide input and assistance in the design, implementation and support of this project. This collaboration of effort will ensure resulting infrastructure meets available guidelines and addresses NITC objectives.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Request for FY2003-04 (Year 1)	Request for FY2004-05 (Year 2)	Total
2. Contractual Services			
2.4 Other	$ 279,250.00	$ 279,250.00	$ 558,500.00
8. Capital Expenditures			
8.1 Hardware	$ 238,500.00	$ 238,500.00	$ 477,000.00
TOTAL COSTS	$ 517,750.00	$ 517,750.00	$ 1,035,500.00
General Funds	$ 258,875.00	$ 258,875.00	$ 517,750.00
Federal Funds	$ 258,875.00	$ 258,875.00	$ 517,750.00
TOTAL FUNDS	$ 517,750.00	$ 517,750.00	$ 1,035,500.00

Project is estimated to take 18 months to complete. This includes 3 months to order, install, configure and test key hardware components and 15 months complete the data cabling based 45 days for each of the ten wiring closets.

Total costs are estimated at $ 1,035,500 with expenditures spread across two budget cycles.
$ 65,000 for the core Ethernet switch in the NSOB
$ 35,000 for a layer 3 switch with both Token Ring and Ethernet capabilities for transition

$543,500 for horizontal data wiring ($169,500 for voice and $374,000 data)
$377,000 for Ethernet switches in the quadrant closets (middle of $143,000 - $610,000 range)
$ 15,000 for fiber installation

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	14	14	13.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	20	24	23	22.3	25
V: Technical Impact	16	15	19	16.7	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	5	8	6.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	6	8	6	6.7	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	13	15	18	15.3	20
			TOTAL	**81**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer 1:
Strengths

- Reasonable explanation of the goals that HHSS is attempting to reach. I did not see a list of projected outcomes - just goals and objectives.
- The agency gives many examples of benefits they feel will be derived from the change.
- Agency makes a valid case for the technical solution they have chosen.
- Adequate plans for implementation.

Weaknesses

- It is doubtful that the technology being replaced is over twenty-five years old, ten to fifteen maybe. However, there is no disagreement that the technology needs replacement.
- Statements are at times undefended. For example, a statement of "network components for Token Ring are about 5 time higher than Ethernet counterparts" is made without any substantiation.
- Statements made are somewhat misleading. For example, the cabling in the NSOB does meet CAT3 standards. CAT3 is not obsolete; it is the current voice grade standard. The additional estimated cost to ensure redundancy of $15,000 is due to the design specified by HHSS. The State is installing CAT6 based on current standards; however, it is a negotiated item with the agency.
- No outline for the agency responsibilities to prepare staff for the disruption an installation of this type will cause, or for any training of staff to make this conversion.
- The risk assessment does not include any issues associated with delays from other sources besides IM Services or the Division of Communications. What about shipping delays, or equipment delivery delays, or equipment that does not perform to the levels expected, or the HHSS operational issues that may cause delays? Training issues??
- The budget describes Ethernet switches that ranged from $143,000 - $610,000. The choice of budgeting for something in the middle price range ($377,000 each) appears to be a little on the high side. It may be been more appropriate to have seen a recommended type of switch with a cost associated.

Reviewer 2:
Strengths

- Very worthwhile project. Relationship to agency goals well documented.
- Good list of benefits. Savings are probably low, but hard to identify.

Weaknesses

- Section indicates that agency has implemented Ethernet topology in majority of existing sites, but still have not identified network equipment that will be used for this project. $467,000 is a big spread between low end and high end equipment needs. This section also indicates that "bandwidth to individual workstations will not be increased". Why not? What will be the speed to the workstations, it's not identified?
- No discussion of project sponsor, nor stakeholders. Does not address work to be performed at each workstation to change from token ring to Ethernet.
- Need to get plan better defined including final decision on equipment and its cost. Doesn't identify any costs for changing the workstations from token ring to Ethernet.

Reviewer 3:
Strengths

- Describes why it is needed quite well.
- Seems like a somewhat conservative estimate of benefits.
- Fairly good technical plan.
- Expensive, but I would think absolutely necessary.

Weaknesses

- Is the 935 users all HHSS staff or everyone in the NSOB?
- Not sure that the acquisition and staffing ramifications are fully addressed.
- Is there a funding risk? Is there redundancy built in? Does this only address HHSS portion of the NSOB or all of NSOB and the agencies there in?
- Is this for only HHSS part or for the whole building?

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Biennial Budget - FY2003-05

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 25-02

Agency	Project	FY2003-04	FY2004-05
HHSS	Server Operating System	$130,375	$130,375

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project addresses the Health and Human Services Systems (HHSS) IT Technology Plan goal of maintaining a stable, responsive, dependable Local Area Network Server architecture. The project includes the acquisition and installation of a new server operating system required to replace the current NTserver operating systems that will be technically obsolete as of June 30, 2003.

This project supports the Agency's staff and ultimate mission of helping people live better lives through effective health and human services. The replacement of the server operating systems across the HHSS supports intra-agency collaboration, communication and cooperation and security. It continues the operation of a common information technology platform upon which staff can depend and one that enables them to securely connect to HHSS information technology resources and other networks.

This project also supports the NITC (Nebraska Information Technology Commission) goal of aggregating demand, reducing acquisition and operational costs and creating support networks.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Request for FY2003-04 (Year 1)	Request for FY2004-05 (Year 2)	Total
8. Capital Expenditures			
8.2 Software	$ 130,375.00	$ 130,375.00	$ 260,750.00
TOTAL COSTS	$ 130,375.00	$ 130,375.00	$ 260,750.00
General Funds	$ 65,187.50	$ 65,187.50	$ 130,375.00
Federal Funds	$ 65,187.50	$ 65,187.50	$ 130,375.00
TOTAL FUNDS	$ 130,375.00	$ 130,375.00	$ 260,750.00

Cost of the purchase of Windows2000 Server licenses: $ 260,750.
No staffing in addition to permanent HHSS technical staff will be required.
No additional Hardware will be required.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	9	13	12	11.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	15	21	15	17.0	25
V: Technical Impact	12	18	15	15.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	9	8	7.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	5	8	10	7.7	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	12	18	20	16.7	20
			TOTAL	**75**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer 1:
Strengths

- Will update version levels for servers to industry current version
- No formal training needed

Weaknesses

- Project is not fully defined, upgrade of servers will have large-scale side effects but they are not discussed. 350 Servers seems to be too many.
- Other options are not actually explored; one is the possibility of consolidating servers
- It would follow that hardware that was installed with the software would not last years longer without some additional changes, evidently they will need no changes?
- Significant risk of implementation interoperability issue and probable outages. No formal training with OJT poses a significant risk in implementation.
- No hardware expenses for ANY of the 350 servers? Server consolidation possibility should be addressed.

Reviewer 2:
Weaknesses

- Only measurement and assessment method is really like a stated outcome.
- Other solutions discussed might have been other operating systems or a slower phased in approach. Only solution discussed is Windows 2000 and full replacement of all server operating systems.
- Total budget is cost of software. I assume that means only staff will install, or if outside help will install that those funds will come from operational money already in HHSS budget.

Reviewer 3:
Strengths

- The description of the project and its goals is concise and focused.
- The justification clearly makes the point that the NT operating system will not be supported in the future placing reliability at risk.
- The migration process is clearly spelled out.

Weaknesses

- The measurement is simplistic and doesn't provide any real metric of success. A migration of this magnitude including active directory needs to be assessed with respect to such criteria as usability, total cost of ownership, etc.
- Very little background is provided as to the function of the 350 servers. If they are simply file servers there are options outside of the Windows environment including Linux, OS X Server, and UNIX with SAMBA. Those servers providing application services are, of course, constrained by platform. That assessment can't be made based on this proposal.
- In a migration of this magnitude including a change of directory structure there are many implementation issues including training. There is no mention of technical elements outside of the upgrade from NT to 2000 or .Net.
- The staff development requirements are confined to operational staff suggesting that there are no client implications. An upgrade of this magnitude includes client issues and these should be addressed.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Biennial Budget - FY2003-05

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 25-03

Agency	Project	FY2003-04	FY2004-05
HHSS	Desktop Operating System Replacement	$589,500	$783,300

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project addresses the Health and Human Services Systems (HHSS) IT Technology Plan goal of achieving a single Desktop Platform for all HHSS staff. The project includes the acquisition and installation of new operating systems, desktop memory upgrades, hard drive upgrades, and replacement of desktops unable to run the new operating system.

This project supports the Agency's staff and ultimate mission of helping people live better lives through effective health and human services. The standardization of desktop operating system across the HHSS supports intra-agency collaboration, communication and cooperation. It sets up a common information technology platform upon which staff can depend and one that enables them to help each other understand and effectively use the technology.

This project also supports the NITC (Nebraska Information Technology Commission) goal of aggregating demand and reducing acquisition and operational costs and creating support networks.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2003-04 (Year 1)	Request for FY2004-05 (Year 2)	Total
8. Capital Expenditures				
8.1 Hardware		$ 418,500.00	$ 418,500.00	$ 837,000.00
8.2 Software	$ 193,800.00	$ 171,000.00	$ 364,800.00	$ 729,600.00
TOTAL COSTS	$ 193,800.00	$ 589,500.00	$ 783,300.00	$ 1,566,600.00
General Funds	$ 96,900.00	$ 294,750.00	$ 391,650.00	$ 783,300.00
Federal Funds	$ 96,900.00	$ 294,750.00	$ 391,650.00	$ 783,300.00
TOTAL FUNDS	$ 193,800.00	$ 589,500.00	$ 783,300.00	$ 1,566,600.00

Costs include:

Upgrade 4800 desktop operating system licenses.	$ 729,600
Upgrade 4200 desktop Random Access Memory (RAM)	$ 147,000
Replace 600 desktops	$ 690,000

Total: $ 1,566,600

Funding Breakdown: $ 783,300 Federal
$ 783,300 State

Funding Sources will vary in state and federal funding matching rates. The overall match rate was used in the calculations.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	5	12	9.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	5	12	20	12.3	25
V: Technical Impact	15	13	20	16.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	5	6	10	7.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	5	3	10	6.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	16	14	20	16.7	20
			TOTAL	**67**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer 1:
Strengths
- Fewer number of operating system versions to support
- Software upgrades are necessary to keep reasonably current
- Individual upgrades should have minimal impact on whole structure
- Costs appear reasonable

Weaknesses
- Section IV.4 It seems unreasonable to assume 10% could stop operation and if it could, it seems that this upgrade without significant desktop replacement would not change that situation. No other solutions explored.
- Training for workers on this new operating system is missing. Does not address support issues of these new 5500 desktops.
- No plan for training of users or support teams.

Reviewer 2:
Weaknesses
- The 2,400 Windows 95 machines are bad candidates for upgrading to higher levels of operating systems. Printing and communications drivers are prone to failure and/or very slow response times. This is very labor intensive and has a high failure probability. These are slow and very outdated.
- This plan is mix of software and memory upgrades that will require testing and good technical support staff
- I get the sense that this is being viewed as a "Heart Transplant". Just put the new equipment in and away we go. I am afraid that HHSS is not realizing the size of the commitment to training, transferring of programs and making sure every thing works correctly.
- If the predictions of lost productivity are true then there is significant risk associated with this project.
- What are the people costs? Training costs?

Reviewer 3:
Strengths
- The proposal clearly states the desire for a homogeneous desktop operating environment and outlines some of the benefits for both end users and those in a support role.
- The description provides necessary information on the scope of the project and the need to update
- Clearly outlines the need for the requested update within the context of support.
- Implementation plan is clear and the timelines are reasonable.
- Risks and barriers are realistically assessed.
- Costs for listed technology are appropriate.

Weaknesses
- A project of this magnitude will fundamentally impact every end user, however, no mention is made of how the benefits to this audience will be assessed.
- No mention of the "mission critical" applications and whether alternative computing platforms would work. Declaring that there are no options can't be verified with the information provided.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Biennial Budget - FY2003-05

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 25-04

Agency	Project	FY2003-04	FY2004-05
HHSS	Computer Hardware Renewal Policy and Program	$4,646,400	$4,646,400

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project proposes to replace one-fourth of the personal computers (PCs) in use by HHSS (Health and Human Services System) per year. HHSS operates approximately 5500 desktop PCs in 150 locations across the state. Many of these PCs are old. 25% were purchased prior to 1998. Use of old PCs hinder job performance for the user. The PCs are slow, the user can only have one program open at a time, many software programs will not run and they experience continual problems causing downtime and requiring a technician to come on-site to repair.

This project supports the Agency's staff and ultimate mission of helping people live better lives through **effective** health and human services. The availability of a reliable PC is essential to HHSS staff performing their job to serve the public of the State of Nebraska.

This project also supports the NITC (Nebraska Information Technology Commission) goal of developing a Technical Plan that recommends a technical infrastructure that will be scalable, reliable, and efficient.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Annual Replacement of one quarter				
	Regulation & Licensure	Services	Finance & Support	Total
Desktops = $1500	$144,000	$1,369,125	$369,375	$1,882,500
Laptops = $2000	$24,000	$141,000	$64,500	$229,500
Subtotal	$168,000	$1,510,125	$433,875	$2,112,000
Plus 10%	$184,800	$1,661,138	$477,263	$2,323,200
Biennium:	$369,600	$3,322,275	$954,525	$4,646,400
State	$369,600	$2,076,422	$954,525	$3,400,547
Federal	$0	$1,245,853	$0	$1,245,853

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	13	12	14	13.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	16	18	23	19.0	25
V: Technical Impact	20	13	18	17.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	6	9	7.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	7	6	8	7.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	15	13	19	15.7	20
			TOTAL	**79**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer 1:
Weaknesses

- What is the failure rate of older PCs? Is downtime significant, or do most of the benefits derive from better security by eliminating Win95 and better support by achieving standardization of hardware and operating systems?
- More information is needed to support the assumption that no additional staff will be needed to implement this policy initially. For example, what is the average time to set up new equipment and prepare old equipment for surplusing? Can that realistically be accomplished with existing staff?

Reviewer 2:
Strengths

- Hardware Replacement- good idea, may be advisable to increase to 30+% of PC's/year. A $1200 PC can be bought. Leasing is an option to consider, but do the math of costs comparison - lease $'s vs buy $'s
- No question of justification or need when considering the ages of systems. Need to consider standardization of hardware, software and training.

Weaknesses

- Need to find a low manpower way to replace many boxes…. Most vendors will pre-configure the equipment any way you want.
- Beside money problem- watch manpower and staff training needs during and after installation.
- No alternative or fail safe plan appears possible.
- Better recalculate and clarify costs- In the Desk Top Operation System portion there is 4800 software operating system licenses and in this part there is a replacement of 25% of PC's which automatically have software. That makes 6100 software upgrades plus 600 PC's listed in the software request.

Reviewer 3:
Strengths

- The sponsor has a good understanding of what they want to accomplish and a workable plan to accomplish it. There is a reasonable measurement approach. Overall, this standard replacement schedule supported by most of industries technical decision-makers.
- The sponsor appears to have a good understanding of their desktop environment.
- This project does enhance the technical environment for HHSS.
- This project has the "approval of the HHSS policy cabinet, administrators, managers and staff".
- It appears that the sponsor has given the identification of barriers and risks adequate thought.
- The sponsor appears to have a good understanding of hardware/software needs and costs.

Weaknesses

- Not very specific about funding plan using a revolving fund to be "repaid from operations".
- It may be difficult to have on-going annual support of this effort.
- Sponsor does not explain how the strategies for minimizing risks would be accomplished.
- I am not sure if the sponsor has accounted for the staffing effort (cost) needed for this project.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Biennial Budget - FY2003-05

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 25-05

Agency	Project	FY2003-04	FY2004-05
HHSS	Help Desk Call Tracking System	$75,000	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The purpose of this project is to replace the current "homegrown" Lotus Notes based call-tracking system with a new improved version. A better call tracking system will reduce Help Desk costs and increase efficiency.

The current system was developed by Andersen Consulting in Lotus Notes version 3.0. It is expensive to maintain and nearly impossible to change. Changes are needed to keep this system current with the ever-changing technology support demands of HHSS.

FUNDING SUMMARY

This information is just an estimate based on research into the average cost of Help Desk Call Tracking Systems for an organization the size of HHSS. Actual cost will vary depending on selection of the vendor.

Server -	$ 6,000
Licenses – 45 users @ $700 per license –	$31,000
Add'l software – 45 users @ $210 per license –	$ 9,450
Maintenance agreement (for two years) -	$ 14,550
Training (including travel expenses for two people) -	$14,000
Total -	$75,000

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	13	12	13	12.7	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	23	23	20	22.0	25
V: Technical Impact	19	15	18	17.3	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	7	6	6.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	7	8	8	7.7	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	15	17	17	16.3	20
			TOTAL	**83**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer 1:
Strengths

- Help Desk - most workable of the three plans. Their current $3000/month maintenance can payout this in less than three years ($3000 x 36 months = $108,000).

Weaknesses

- Needs more selling to potential customers and higher authority.
- Beware- 2-3 FTE are needed install, configure and implement. There is significant training costs and problem resolution issues when dealing with multiple locations.

Reviewer 2:
Strengths

- Goals and outcomes well defined and reasonable.
- Good logic used to discuss alternatives.

Weaknesses

- Measurement and assessment methods read more like expected outcomes. Might have described measurements such as % less time per call, % decreased call volume, % decreased calls requiring a technician, % fewer calls required to fix average problem, specific reports that would become available that aren't currently, etc.
- Maintenance contract savings only real benefit listed. Might have discussed increased productivity of employees with less time per call and fewer calls. What additional things can the employees do since they will be on the phone with clients less?
- No strengths or weaknesses described. Assumes software will run on current workstations, but doesn't say how they know that.

Reviewer 3:
Strengths

- Seems fairly straight forward

Weaknesses

- Is technician access in the field via a ISP or a VPN or thru a dedicated state network connection. Is this a Internet or Intranet application (has security ramifications).
- I don't see the ability to interface to CAMS listed as a risk.
- Is there any HHSS staff operation support costs that should be listed, even if it is an ongoing operational cost.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Biennial Budget - FY2003-05

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 25-06

Agency	Project	FY2003-04	FY2004-05
HHSS	CHARTS Project	$18,438,430	$18,896,388

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

CHARTS (Children Have A Right To Support) is the state's Child Support computer system. CHARTS is a tool used by the Child Support program to enforce child support orders and collect child support money for children who need it. CHARTS is one of the reasons the state's Child Support collections have increased significantly in the last few years. Collections have increased 13.53% or $19.2 million to an all-time high of $161.2 million for federal fiscal year 2001.

CHARTS II was designed to support centralized collection and disbursement of Child Support payments. Previously, child support collection and disbursement is handled by Clerks of the District Court in each county. Centralization of child support collection/disbursement is mandated by the Federal government, through the 1996 PRWORA (Welfare Reform) legislation. Programming of CHARTS II was completed in 2001 and implemented in December 2001.

Nebraska successfully completed the implementation process for PRWORA (Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996) financial distribution. The State Disbursement Unit became fully operational statewide December 21-26, 2001. Nebraska avoided the federal penalty of $5 million for FFY 2002. Nebraska is already showing increased child support collections in 2002, 723,665 payouts issued to date for $153,277,750.78. Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families, Office of Child Support Enforcement acknowledged and awarded the achievement with plaques and a ceremony July 19, 2002.

Nebraska was required to implement the system statewide. The team had to prepare synchronized work plans for the implementation period for CHARTS, the State Distribution Unit (Treasurer's State Payment Center), JUSTICE (the court information system) and Douglas County.

The CHARTSII/SDU was implemented through a "rapid Phase-in" approach. In this approach, CHARTS II was implemented statewide, without a preliminary pilot period or graduated rollout. The combined effect of these characteristics put this project in a relatively high-risk bracket. The team was supported by a Steering Committee comprised of Stakeholders in HHSS/JUSTICE/Treasurers Office/DAS-IMS and the Policy Research Office.

Child support payments can now be made with credit cards, through automatic withdrawal, or by check or money order. Child support payments can also be directly deposited into bank accounts. Almost half of the child support owed in Nebraska is collected through income withholding from paychecks. Employers can now send one check to one location, rather than sending separate checks to each of the 93 counties where their employees might have had a child support court order.

All custodial and non-custodial parents were notified of the changes via mass mailings (monthly beginning in August 2001). HHSS staff provided an automated Voice Response Unit to assist parents; put the Child Support Customer Call Center in place in Wausa, NE to provide personal contact for questions; met with the Clerks of the District Court to provide information and coordinate the changes. The Treasurer's offices established a call center and installed a web site at www.NebraskaChildSupport.com for information about child support payments and a toll free number, 1-877-631-9973. Additionally child support information is available at www.hhs.state.ne.us.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Biennial Budget - FY2003-05

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

FUNDING SUMMARY

Db Cd	Debit Description	Charts Budget FY03	Charts Budget FY04	Charts Budget FY05
02	MVS - R36 PROCESSOR	$ 2,344,622	$ 2,723,640	$ 3,002,813
03	MVS-DB2 INQUIRY CPU	828,515	967,483	1,065,464
11	MVS-LOCAL PRINTING - 1 PART	331	324	324
12	MVS-TAPE MOUNTS	49,682	66,370	78,113
13	MVS-JOB SETUP	426,105	433,364	442,031
14	MVS-DISK STORAGE	554,411	636,830	732,353
15	MVS-JOB OUTPUT	22,994	22,727	23,182
32	MVS-DISPATCH ONLINE VIEW	2,942	2,854	2,854
34	MVS-CICS	90,000	110,644	114,962
35	MVS-CICS TEST	1,850	2,192	2,256
42	MVS-LOCAL PRINTING - 2 PART	6	5	5
45	PAGE PRINT	81,180	74,911	73,413
46	WARRANT PRINTING	2,051	1,687	1,653
53	CMS-R22 PROCESSOR PRIME	6	5	5
64	CMS-DISK STORAGE	88	83	78
107	JOB SCHEDULER	196	156	156
109	MONTHLY SERVER SUPPORT	22,220	22,579	24,303
397	SOFTWARE MAINTENANCE	40,645	55,328	44,571
Misc.		142	113	115
	Total	4,467,986	5,121,296	5,608,651
900	Contractors	6,000,068	4,955,000	4,930,300
901	FTE	1,172,791	1,174,250	1,169,553
	Total Staff Cost	7,172,859	6,129,250	6,099,853
170	DCS	210,684	213,084	213,084
	Sub-Total	11,851,529	11,463,630	11,921,588
140	Business Analysts	4,217,734	4,147,000	4,147,000
	Grand Total	16,069,263	15,610,630	16,068,588
	HHS Budget Cost Only	2,827,802	2,827,800	2,827,800
	IMServices - IS & T Grand Total	18,897,065	18,438,430	18,896,388

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	13	7	11.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	24	23	16	21.0	25
V: Technical Impact	16	15	10	13.7	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	5	3	5.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	9	8	3	6.7	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	14	19	13	15.3	20
			TOTAL	**73**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer 1:

Strengths

- The sponsor identified in detail the penalties if this is not done (millions of dollars). It is also Federally mandated.
- It was noted that the costs to do this project are far less than the sanctions.
- There is minimal technical impact.
- This is basically a known application and project. Not as much explanation is required.
- Items were well defined in Executive Summary.

Weaknesses

- Gives only a brief description of the schedule in the Executive Summary.
- Appeared to show total CHARTS budget, rather than the cost of this project.

Reviewer 2:

Strengths

- Good job of describing overall issues and phased approach
- Mandate very clear along with financial implications.

Weaknesses

- Success measures not clear.
- Alternative solutions? Though it sounds like the rapid development approach may have precluded it?
- I recognize that changes are enhancements to existing systems, though it might be useful to clarify the implications on workloads, growth, scalability issues, etc..?

Reviewer 3:

Strengths

- Fair description of federal mandates and financial benefit of successfully completing project.

Weaknesses

- General description of project background and objectives, but few specific goals provided
- No discussion of alternative solutions.
- There was little discussion of impact on present systems, or applicable standards and compatibility issues. The nature of this project may assume that those standards will be met.
- Again, little information available. Because there is an ongoing team, these issues may be addressed, but the proposal doesn't discuss them.
- Risks are identified in terms of non compliance with Federal mandates. Risks inherent in the project are not addressed.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Biennial Budget - FY2003-05

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 25-07

Agency	Project	FY2003-04	FY2004-05
HHSS	HIPAA	$11,658,540	$12,001,680

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The State of Nebraska Health and Human Services System (HHSS) is comprised of three human services agencies. Within HHSS, the Department of Health and Human Services Finance and Support department, hereafter referred to as the Department, is the state agency designated to administer the Nebraska Medical Assistance Program (NMAP). Nebraska has a certified and operational Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS). The Department serves as the fiscal agent for the NMAP.

As a 'covered entity', the NMAP must address HIPAA compliance. The Department recently completed two planning projects related to the enhancement of the MMIS to meet HIPAA mandates and improve current business and data processes. An assessment of the impact of HIPAA legislation on its Medicaid operations and the MMIS has been completed and a project to create a new logical database model for the MMIS was concluded earlier this year. Both projects were approved by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid (CMS – formerly HCFA) and funded at the 90% FFP level.

Achieving compliance with HIPAA regulations will require major change to the existing MMIS. Nebraska's 25 year old MMIS does not support all mandated functionality and will require broad system enhancements. N-FOCUS and several other mid-range applications will also have HIPAA impacts and require changes.

While remediation of the MMIS is by far the largest effort for HIPAA compliance, additional automated application systems and programs are impacted by HIPAA. These include Distributed Systems, AVATAR/AIMS (case management software used by the 24 hour facilities), N-FOCUS, all health systems, Mental Health and Substance abuse programs and applications, Point of Sale Drug system used by pharmacists statewide, Developmental disability programs and any other applications/programs providing direct services.

FUNDING SUMMARY

MMIS HIPAA DEVELOPMENT

Db Cd	Debit Description	HIPAA Budget FY03	HIPAA Budget FY04	HIPAA Budget FY05
02/05	Processor	$ 1,354,320	$ 924,000	$ 924,000
13	Job Setup	$ 1,213	$ -	$ -
14	Disk Storage	$ 201,600	$ 105,000	$ 105,000
15	Job Output	$ 14,616	$ -	$ -
22	LAN Segment Connection	$ 3,600	$ 3,600	$ 3,600
34	CICS	$ 207,000	$ -	$ -
109	Monthly Server Support	$ 5,760	$ 5,760	$ 5,760
000	Misc.	$ 1,163,000	$ -	$ -
	Total	$ 2,951,109	$ 1,038,360	$ 1,038,360
	Total Staff Cost	$ 9,786,900	$ 10,245,180	$ 10,588,320
170	DCS	$ 25,200	$ 25,000	$ 25,000
	HHS Budget Cost (only)	$ 350,000	$ 350,000	$ 350,000
	IMService - IS & T Grand Total	$ 13,113,209	$ 11,658,540	$ 12,001,680

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	13	9	12.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	24	23	21	22.7	25
V: Technical Impact	18	18	13	16.3	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	9	8	6	7.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	10	10	8	9.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	13	19	15	15.7	20
			TOTAL	**84**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer 2:
Strengths
- Goals very specific
- Mandate well described.
- Plans/Milestones well defined
- Risks well noted

Weaknesses
- Training and ongoing support issues/implications?

Reviewer 3:
Strengths
- Good discussion of benefits and of mandates leading to project.
- Milestones identified, and high level tasks. Some discussion of project team in other sections was utilized for this scoring.
- Good discussion of some specific strategies.

Weaknesses
- No discussion of sponsors, training requirements, or ongoing support requirements.
- Risks identified are primarily risk of non compliance with Federal requirements. No discussion of project specific risks.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Biennial Budget - FY2003-05

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 25-08

Agency	Project	FY2003-04	FY2004-05
HHSS	NFOCUS Project	$12,989,315	$13,343,217

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The N-FOCUS application provides support and automation for the following HHSS programs:

Aid to Dependent Children/Medicaid (ADC)
Assistance to the Aged; Blind (AABD)
Adult Protective Services (APS)
Child Care (CC)
Children & Family Services/Medicaid (CFS)
Emergency Assistance (EA)
Employment First (EF)
Food Stamp Program (FSP)
Former Ward/Medicaid (FW)
Independent Living/ Medicaid (IL)
Juvenile Court (JC)
Medical (MED)
Refugee Resettlement Program (RR)
Subsidized Adoption - grant only (SA)
Subsidized Adoption/Medical (SA/Med)
Subsidized Guardianship (SG)
Subsidized Guardianship/Medical (SG/Med)
Social Services for Aged & Disabled (SSAD)
Social Services for Children & Families (SSCF)
Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI)
Waiver: Adults with Disabilities (AD)
Waiver: Adults with Developmental Disabilities (ADD)
Waiver: Children with Developmental Disabilities (CDD)
Waiver: Developmental Disabilities Case Management (DDCM)
Waiver: Early Intervention (EI)
Waiver: Katie Beckett Plan
Developmental Disabilities (DD)

Included in this project are the updates to the programs that include federal/state mandate or policy changes, necessary technical changes, and changes considered essential to the users of the system. N-FOCUS issues $28 Million dollars in Benefits and Payments monthly. N-FOCUS supports 2,426 users, both internal and external access. N-FOCUS has over 200 thousand Master Cases and over 600 thousand individuals (clients and others) for whom it tracks data.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Db Cd	Debit Description	N-F Budget FY03	N-F Budget FY04	N-F Budget FY05
02	MVS - R36 PROCESSOR	$ 1,639,152	$ 1,945,266	$ 2,144,655
03	MVS-DB2 INQUIRY CPU	371	409	450

11	MVS-LOCAL PRINTING - 1 PART	5,640	5,703	5,703
12	MVS-TAPE MOUNTS	113,792	151,028	177,749
13	MVS-JOB SETUP	260,582	279,813	285,409
14	MVS-DISK STORAGE	362,366	416,796	479,315
15	MVS-JOB OUTPUT	13,566	14,566	14,857
32	MVS-DISPATCH ONLINE VIEW	484	444	444
34	MVS-CICS	1,866,287	2,215,665	2,302,127
35	MVS-CICS TEST	10,577	12,744	13,119
45	PAGE PRINT	186,092	185,185	181,481
46	WARRANT PRINTING	31,054	30,645	30,032
53	CMS-R22 PROCESSOR PRIME	27	29	28
109	MONTHLY SERVER SUPPORT	271	198	166
305	IMS TRAINING - CLASSES	1,409	1,409	1,409
327	TAPE CARTRIDGE - 3480	9	9	9
397	SOFTWARE MAINTENANCE	410,237	410,237	410,237
Misc.		2	3	-
	Total	4,901,918	5,670,149	6,047,190
	Total Staff Cost	5,763,378	5,846,286	5,823,146
170	DCS	210,684	213,084	213,084
	HHS Budget Cost Only	1,259,797	1,259,796	1,259,797
	IMServices - IS & T Grand Total	12,135,777	12,989,315	13,343,217

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	12	10	12.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	24	21	18	21.0	25
V: Technical Impact	15	17	14	15.3	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	9	7	5	7.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	7	7	5	6.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	14	19	15	16.0	20
			TOTAL	78	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer 1:
Strengths

- Each effort is very detailed, but not real difficult to comprehend.
- Explains in detail the reasons for the project and the impact if not done.
- There is minimal technical impact.
- This is basically a known application and project. Most of this information has been provided in other attachments.
- The sponsor knows what they want to do. It appears lack of funding is the primary risk.

Weaknesses

- This is many changes/projects in NFOCUS roled into one proposal. This is good from a "release" perspective, but makes it more difficult to understand from a overall project perspective.
- Appeared to show total NFOCUS budget, rather than the cost of this project.

Reviewer 2:
Strengths

- Mandate issues clear.
- Nice and clear breakdown by function and multi year projections.

Weaknesses

- 1) Alternatives not noted? 2) Scope is large and therefore difficult to "summarize"?
- Undrstand that the base system "in place" - would seem that that the "downstream" implications (even if minimal) should be acknowledged?
- Lot of detail in back of form - could be summarized for major deliverables for the various pieces?
- Understand that major risks already idenitifed/addressed but not clear about any contingencies/strategies that might be needed?

Reviewer 3:
Strengths

- Good description of high level goals, objectives and beneficiaries.
- Good detail regarding benefits of individual initiatives and of mandates leading to project(s).

Weaknesses

- Little detail regarding alternative solutions considered.
- Little discussion regarding conformity or compatibility.
- Most of the planning described actions leading to current status. Only a few described milestones or future activities.
- A few risks were identified, but not in a systematic way.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Biennial Budget - FY2003-05

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 37-01

Agency	Project	FY2003-04	FY2004-05
Workers Compensation Court	Extended Computer Automation Project –Electronic File System, Electronic Forms Automation, and Electronic Records Management	$326,000	$24,000

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The court has developed over the last seven years a comprehensive case management system based upon Oracle database technology and an online screen and reporting system developed using Oracle tools. This case management system provides mission-critical information to staff in all areas of the court. (The subsystems are listed in the court's IT Comprehensive Plan.) This "Extended Computer Automation" project is being planned as a long range, ten year effort to implement the court's Strategic Plan as defined in the IT Comprehensive Plan and other mandatory requirements placed on the Court (electronic records management, security, disaster recovery, as examples). In addition the Supreme Court is moving forward with its automation projects, some of which run parallel with strategic plans of the Workers Compensation Court.

This project over it's 10 year life will address Electronic File System, Electronic Forms Automation, Adjudicated Electronic Filing Processes, Electronic Records Management, Security, and Disaster Recovery. The estimated approximate 10 Year Project Cost is: One-Time Hardware, Software, Training $1,250,000 -- On-Going Costs $187,500 = $1,437,500.

During the first two fiscal years of the 10 Year project, the court is planning on addressing the Electronic File System, initial integration of the Electronic File System with the court's Oracle Case Management system, Electronic Forms Automation, and an initial implementation of Electronic Records Management.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Request for FY2003-04	Request for FY2004-05	Request for FY2005-06	Request for FY2006-07	Total
2. Contractual Services					
2.4 Other	$ 126,000.00				$ 126,000.00
5. Training	$ 5,000.00				$ 5,000.00
6. Travel	$ 5,000.00				$ 5,000.00
7. Other Operating Costs	$ 24,000.00	$ 24,000.00	$ 24,000.00	$ 24,000.00	$ 96,000.00
8. Capital Expenditures					
8.1 Hardware	$ 20,000.00				$ 20,000.00
8.2 Software	$ 146,000.00				$ 146,000.00
TOTAL COSTS	$ 326,000.00	$ 24,000.00	$ 24,000.00	$ 24,000.00	$ 398,000.00
Cash Funds	$ 326,000.00	$ 24,000.00			$ 350,000.00
TOTAL FUNDS	$ 326,000.00	$ 24,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ 350,000.00

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Biennial Budget - FY2003-05

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	12	12	12.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	20	19	23	20.7	25
V: Technical Impact	16	15	16	15.7	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	8	8	8.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	7	6	9	7.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	16	17	16	16.3	20
			TOTAL	**80**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer 1:
Weaknesses

- At some point, the project should determine what aspects of the Supreme Court's automated system, especially electronic filing, are applicable to the Workers Compensation Court. To what extent are we building two duplicative systems for electronic filing of court cases?
- There is not enough detail and explanation for the reader to understand the technical impact of this project.
- Another risk is financial -- that costs will greatly exceed estimates. The narrative should include strategies to address each specific risk.

Reviewer 2:
Strengths

- Good base description of what is planned and why.
- Acknowledges the existence of other systems that may need to be interfaced.
- Have identified all the technologies involved.

Weaknesses

- Seemed like the we would need to know if this part of their ten year plan is capable of standing by itself (if they rest of the ten year plan is not achieved, undertaken, or funded).
- The hardware requirements seem a little soft. What is needed is identified but the magnitude is not.
- Need to describe what the RFP is intended to procure and if there is any phasing to the project.
- Seems to me that the interface between the 'file management' software and the Oracle 'File management' would be a large risk.
- It seems to me that 20,000 for hardware, that would cover both a multiprocessor server and optical juke box is optimistic.

Reviewer 3:
Strengths

- Good description of overall goals. Closely tied to agency's comprehensive IT plan.
- Intangible benefits well documented. The agency has worked in collaboration with other state entities, and national organizations, in determining the proposed course of action.
- Risks are well documented and addressed.

Weaknesses

- Tangible benefits and cost savings not well documented.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Biennial Budget - FY2003-05

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-01

Agency	Project	FY2003-04	FY2004-05
NET	KLNE-TV NTSC Replacement Transmitter	$650,000	

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will replace the existing KLNE-TV transmitter near Lexington, NE. The replacement is necessary for Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission (NETC) to continue to provide public educational television programming to Lexington, and the south-central part of Nebraska. The current transmitter is nearly 20 years old and approaching the end of it's useful life. The transmitter uses costly tubes needing periodic replacement. A new solid state transmitter will use transistors, eliminating the costly tube replacements. Parts for the current transmitter are becoming difficult to obtain on a timely basis, and are very costly. As the transmitter ages, the need for replacement parts increases.

There are essentially 3 stages to the DTV conversion. The first is the period of build out. At this point in the process, the new DTV is being installed and tested on a new channel assigned by the FCC. NETC currently uses channel 3 in Lexington for NTSC (analog) transmission. We have been assigned channel 26 for an interim DTV channel. For a period of some years we will have to transmit full power NTSC and interim power DTV simultaneously. This is the second or simulcast phase of the conversion. Whenever the FCC authorizes termination of NTSC transmission, we will have to select a permanent DTV channel and use it. This DTV-only time will be the third stage of the conversion and it will then be complete. For a number of technical reasons, a lower channel assignment is preferred to a higher channel assignment. This means that when we reach the final step we will need to convert the NTSC transmitter to a DTV transmitter to occupy channel 3 and give channel 26 back to the federal government. By occupying channel 3 our electrical costs will be significantly lower than if we were to keep channel 26 instead. This is why we are only operating the interim DTV channel at an interim power and not at full power.

When the NETC eliminates NTSC transmissions in favor of DTV in the Lexington area per FCC regulations, the new transmitter will easily convert to digital. This is expected to occur sometime after 2006. The current transmitter is becoming problematic, and will not convert to digital at all.

The Commission anticipates funding from the federal Public Telecommunications Facilities Program (PTFP) for 40% of the cost of this equipment. The State's portion is considered by PTFP as matching funds.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Request for FY2003-04 (Year 1)	Total
8. Capital Expenditures		
8.1 Hardware	$ 650,000.00	$ 650,000.00
8.4 Other	Installation included in hardware cost	$ -
TOTAL COSTS	$ 650,000.00	$ 650,000.00
General Funds	$ 390,000.00	$ 390,000.00
Federal Funds	$ 260,000.00	$ 260,000.00
TOTAL FUNDS	$ 650,000.00	$ 650,000.00

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	14	14	14.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	24	24	21	23.0	25
V: Technical Impact	19	18	18	18.3	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	9	9	9.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	8	9	6	7.7	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	19	18	16	17.7	20
			TOTAL	**90**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer 1:

Strengths

- They did an excellent job of explaining the project, describing the outcomes and measurements, and the relationship to the agency IT plan.
- Benefits were well defined and the DTV conversion process was explained adequately.
- The technical impact statement and the issues surrounding reliability, security and scalability were all addressed very well.
- Implementation plan is well defined. All other issues were addressed well.
- Most of the risks were well defined and discussed with strategies of minimize the risk.
- Appears to be appropriate and well explained. Bottom line is that the State needs to decide whether we wish to continue to offer this service or not. If we decide to offer services in this area, we really have not choice but to replace the transmitter.

Reviewer 2:

Strengths

- The goals and objectives are pretty much spelled out by the federal mandate. NETC has done this before so should know the process pretty good by now
- Benefits are meeting the federal mandate and providing better service on the local scale. This is spelled out in the application but there are really not a lot of choices available in meeting the FCC charge
- Upgrading of the transmitter and potential repairs seem to have been taken into consideration
- The team in charge of implementing this change is experienced and capable. Other staff development requirements seem to be somewhat minimal. Support and repair has been taken into consideration.
- Risk is in not meeting the mandate and endangering the broadcast license or in having to continue two feeds and spending a lot more on electric bills. Two vendors and a federal mandate do not leave a great many options.

Reviewer 3:

Strengths

- Good overview of the project. Obviously, NETC has done this before.
- Good explanation of the technology.
- NETC has a good engineering staff to implement these projects.

Weaknesses

- The only weakness is the lack of estimates for the savings from reduced electricity and maintenance.
- One could question the advisability of using channel 3 rather than 26 in Lexington due to the noise and propagation problems. One Nebraska broadcaster is not planning to use low band channels for HDTV.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Biennial Budget - FY2003-05

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-02

Agency	Project	FY2003-04	FY2004-05
NET	KMNE-TV NTSC Replacement Transmitter		$650,000

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will replace the existing KMNE-TV transmitter near Bassett, NE. The replacement is necessary for Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission (NETC) to continue to provide public educational television programming to Bassett, and the north-central part of Nebraska. The current transmitter is nearly 20 years old and approaching the end of it's useful life. The transmitter uses costly tubes needing periodic replacement. A new solid state transmitter will use transistors, eliminating the costly tube replacements. Parts for the current transmitter are becoming difficult to obtain on a timely basis, and are very costly. As the transmitter ages, the need for replacement parts increases.

There are essentially 3 stages to the DTV conversion. The first is the period of build out. At this point in the process, the new DTV is being installed and tested on a new channel assigned by the FCC. NETC currently uses channel 7 in Bassett for NTSC (analog) transmission. We have been assigned channel 15 for an interim DTV channel. For a period of some years we will have to transmit full power NTSC and interim power DTV simultaneously. This is the second or simulcast phase of the conversion. Whenever the FCC authorizes termination of NTSC transmission, we will have to select a permanent DTV channel and use it. This DTV-only time will be the third stage of the conversion and it will then be complete. For a number of technical reasons, a lower channel assignment is preferred to a higher channel assignment. This means that when we reach the final step we will need to convert the NTSC transmitter to a DTV transmitter to occupy channel 7 and give channel 15 back to the federal government. By occupying channel 7 our electrical costs will be significantly lower than if we were to keep channel 15 instead. This is why we are only operating the interim DTV channel at an interim power and not at full power.

When the NETC eliminates NTSC transmissions in favor of DTV in the Bassett area per FCC regulations, the new transmitter will easily convert to digital. This is expected to occur sometime after 2006. The current transmitter is becoming problematic, and will not convert to digital at all.

The Commission anticipates funding from the federal Public Telecommunications Facilities Program (PTFP) for 40% of the cost of this equipment. The State's portion is considered by PTFP as matching funds.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Request for FY2004-05 (Year 2)	Total
8. Capital Expenditures		
8.1 Hardware	$ 650,000.00	$ 650,000.00
8.4 Other	Installation included in hardware cost	$ -
TOTAL COSTS	$ 650,000.00	$ 650,000.00
General Funds	$ 390,000.00	$ 390,000.00
Federal Funds	$ 260,000.00	$ 260,000.00
TOTAL FUNDS	$ 650,000.00	$ 650,000.00

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Biennial Budget - FY2003-05

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	14	14	14.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	24	24	21	23.0	25
V: Technical Impact	19	18	18	18.3	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	9	9	9.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	8	9	6	7.7	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	19	18	16	17.7	20
			TOTAL	**90**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer 1:
Strengths

- They did an excellent job of explaining the project, describing the outcomes and measurements, and the relationship to the agency IT plan.
- Benefits were well defined and the DTV conversion process was explained adequately.
- The technical impact statement and the issues surrounding reliability, security and scalability were all addressed very well.
- Implementation plan is well defined. All other issues were addressed well.
- Most of the risks were well defined and discussed with strategies of minimize the risk.
- Appears to be appropriate and well explained. Bottom line is that the State needs to decide whether we wish to continue to offer this service or not. If we decide to offer services in this area, we really have not choice but to replace the transmitter.

Weaknesses

- I did not really understand the comment under risks that talked about "NETC will ask to combine funds from that project and this in order to complete the KLNE project in the FY04-05 biennium." Does this mean that one project is more important than the other?

Reviewer 2:
Strengths

- NETC has a track record or having done this type of thing before so has the goals of the project down. The fact that a federal mandate exists to complete this project somehow will limit the options available.
- Again, not doing anything is not an option due to federal mandate. Don't know about the economic return on the investment but to not complete the project would be costly. It is hard to measure the economic impact of a tv channel on a community but the intangible of a Nebraska city having access to NETV is important.
- Application touched on the ability to upgrade if the opportunity is presented and also seems prepared for potential of replacing parts. This system would be compatible with the statewide infrastructure and the federal mandate.
- Everything seems to be in order as it should be since this is not a new process to NETV. The process for making the change and training the staff seems feasible.
- Risks are minimal since this process has been used before. Main risk would seem to be in not complying with federal mandates. The application seems to outline a manner in which the delay of the process could be addressed without endangering the broadcast license.

Reviewer 3:
Strengths

- Good overview of the project. Obviously, NETC has done this before.
- Good explanation of the technology.
- NETC has a good engineering staff to implement these projects.

Weaknesses

- The only weakness is the lack of estimates for the savings from reduced electricity and maintenance.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Biennial Budget - FY2003-05

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-03

Agency	Project	FY2003-04	FY2004-05
NET	Phone System Replacement / Switch Upgrade	$0	$198,000

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will replace the telephone system at the Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission (NETC) building.

Telephone services are part of the core of the NETC business infrastructure. The most recent example of this type of service is the "State of Nebraska AMBER Project". This project uses a dedicated phone line to route the State Patrol dispatcher AMBER Alert notifications to NET's on air switcher. Many other essential services such as the Nebraska Video Conferencing Network (NVCN) and the NEB*Sat Help Desk rely on our phone services. Phone and voice mail communications are essential to the organization for internal business processes and inter-departmental communication as well.

The NET Telephone System Project addresses the replacement of an aging Nortel 51C PBX in use at NET, upgrade to or replacement of the Merridian switch, replacement of phone sets and the attendant console. The Nortel 51C platform is no longer sold and while parts are still available, the system will be phased out. Alltel has confirmed this in a letter sent to NET on August 22nd of this year. This system replacement request addresses future options and considerations such as VOIP (voice-over-IP). This will insure NET's investment provides flexibility to take advantage of new telecommunications technology while still addressing current telecomm industry standards.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2003-04 (Year 1)	Request for FY2004-05 (Year 2)	Total
8. Capital Expenditures				
8.1 Hardware	$ -		$ 179,903.00	$ 179,903.00
8.2 Software				$ -
8.3 Network				$ -
8.4 Other			$ 18,097.00	$ 18,097.00
TOTAL COSTS	$ -	$ -	$ 198,000.00	$ 198,000.00
General Funds			$ 198,000.00	$ 198,000.00
TOTAL FUNDS	$ -	$ -	$ 198,000.00	$ 198,000.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	10	13	12	11.7	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	16	22	22	20.0	25
V: Technical Impact	13	18	17	16.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	8	9	7.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	6	8	8	7.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	13	20	15	16.0	20
			TOTAL	**79**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer 1:
Strengths

- Agency makes a solid case for a replacement telephone system, not necessarily the technology that they have chosen.
- A strong case was made for the technical issues facing NET if they continue with their current voice solution.
- Appears that the agency attempted to get a quote from their current provider to create a budgetary number.

Weaknesses

- There is a statement indicating that they are a subset of the University system but I do not see any input from the University Telecomm Center. Additionally, the customers they mention are not requiring an IP solution, so it is unclear that an IP solution is necessary to supply the needed telephony change. NET also indicates that they are replacing their voice mail system but not with this purchase. Why? How can they be sure that these systems will be compatible?
- Again, the business case is made for a new telephony solution - not necessarily an IP solution. A statement is made that "selecting systems capable of both technologies is not more expensive …" Without any supporting documentation, it is difficult to comprehend that this could be true. There is a statement that "the University has no plans to adopt IP telephony". If this system is a subset of the University, isn't this problematic?
- Is there a requirement on an IP system to change out all analog sets to digital sets? This represents $36,000 of the expenditure. The proposed system may be IP capable, but will it require additional software costs to enable IP extension ports or tie line ports? Will there be additional Teleco charges to make the connection between the Central Office? It is difficult to identify the warranty issues related to this system.
- The implementation schedule appears to be aggressive considering the RFP process that should/would take place. Administration of an IP Telephony system would require additional training that I don't see accounted for in this document. Does NET have the appropriate staff to maintain this type of system and all issues related to Moves, Adds and Changes? Are the current maintenance fees sufficient to cover an expense for maintaining a fairly complex system?
- The weaknesses did not identify any issues related to operation of an IP solution. How are the issues related to E911 resolved? How is the issue of the University infrastructure not considering IP telephony create a barrier? Has NET considered a traditional system that has the ability for future upgrade?
- This project indicates in the financials the need for assistance and expertise from an entity that is in the voice telecommunications business that does not have a vested interest such as a vendor. The cost for this system appears to be on the high side. Without much effort, we were able to identify almost $23,000 in savings on this quote for just the sets. There is not disagreement that this system needs to be replaced. We would encourage the agency to work with the appropriate telecommunications entity to identify needs, functions and the appropriate technology to address these issues.

Reviewer 2:
Strengths

- The 51C will probably stop being sold in 2003. Nortel apparently does not have a set time period that they will support a product after they quit selling it. It is in NET's best interests to begin evaluating alternatives to replace the 51C.
- Looking at a flexible solution is an excellent plan. While VoIP solutions are readily available they still have some issues to be worked out. It appears the 61C, if chosen, would provide NET the opportunity to either stick with traditional telephony service, or incorporate IP telephony as it becomes more widely accepted as the trend of the future.

- If the 61C is selected there are multiple vendors locally available to provide various levels of support on an ongoing basis. NET would continue to be able to support programs within both the State and University environments.
- Good, attainable milestones. Staff will be prepared to support the new system with a little additional training.
- I like the attention that has been given to not wanting to commit NET to a solution that may not fit into the long term picture of the State or UNL's telecom systems.
- I think the budget is well put together and accurate of what the costs will be, and includes the materials and equipment needed.

Weaknesses

- Are there specific features or functionalities that an upgraded system will bring that aren't available on the current system?
- What other alternatives are available. A large portion of service to other University and State agencies is provided via centrex. How does this compare to the 36 or 60 month costs of buying, installing and supporting a new PBX?
- What else can the 61C, or Cisco's Call Manager do for NET. Any specific opportunities to expand or improve services or to increase operating efficiencies?
- At some point in time NET may be required to provide the 911 center with a database, updated in real time, of station locations. No mention of that potential need is made in this plan in terms of what might be required for ongoing support.
- What other IP solutions did you look into. Does the fact that they are highly proprietary create any issues in terms of being tied to a particular vendor for all of your needs? What types of licensing issues will there be as people want to experiment with "soft phones"?

Reviewer 3:

Strengths

- Clear explanation of project and beneficiaries.
- Current system reaching end of its useful life. Reasonable product research and evaluation. Current platform not sustainable. Integral part of meeting statutory objectives.
- Description of system and the technical elements. Platform will be flexible, scalable and offers variety of features.
- Project team identified including their roles and responsibilities. Time line adequate and achievable. Training and support addressed.
- Identifies risk of extending life of current system. Maintenance agreement focus.
- Budget estimated cost appears to be inclusive of the list of hardware and software.

Weaknesses

- Significant emphasis on IP telephony. No state or federal mandate.
- Strengths and weaknesses of proposal based on analog versus IP configuration.
- Limited information on preliminary plans. Insufficient training prior to cutover.
- Limited discussion of barriers. Tier contract could bind NETV to a system that may not meet expectations.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Biennial Budget - FY2003-05

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 78-01

Agency	Project	FY2003-04	FY2004-05
Crime Commission / CJIS	CJIS - Criminal Justice Integration and Automation	$1,020,112	$790,112

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

In 1995 the Crime Commission created the CJIS Advisory Committee (Criminal Justice Information System) in response to an identified need for a standing body to work on information technology needs and data sharing among state and local agencies. There are 26 standing members of the committee including all major state criminal justice agencies, professional associations and larger jurisdictions. While the Crime Commission is not an operational agency this cooperative project is hosted by the Commission due to its contact and interaction with various parts of the criminal justice system.

CJIS has undertaken strategic planning initiatives as well as significant programs to share data (through a secure Internet based data warehouse), to implement local automation and others. CJIS does not encompass nor supercede other initiatives by state or local agencies. Instead it provides a way to both initiate projects that need a collaborative sponsor as well as a forum for state and local agencies to bring issues on data sharing to the forefront. The efforts of CJIS and the Crime Commission reflect ongoing needs and the budget proposal is the culmination of past initiatives and current priorities. It should be noted that general funds are primarily used for ongoing project management and support in addition to project maintenance. Federal grant funds have provided the bulk of monies for project implementation.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2003-04 (Year 1)	Request for FY2004-05 (Year 2)	Request for FY2005-06 (Year 3)	Request for FY2006-07 (Year 4)	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs	$ 186,000.00	$ 76,209.00	$ 76,209.00	$ 78,000.00	$ 80,000.00	$ 80,000.00	$ 576,418.00
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design	$ 3,000,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ 300,000.00	$ 300,000.00	$ 300,000.00	$ 300,000.00	$ 4,700,000.00
2.2 Programming	$ 3,000,000.00	$ 400,000.00	$ 300,000.00	$ 300,000.00	$ 300,000.00	$ 300,000.00	$ 4,600,000.00
2.3 Project Management	$ 26,369.00	$ 17,403.00	$ 67,403.00	$ 75,500.00	$ 83,500.00	$ 83,500.00	$ 353,675.00
2.4 Other							$ -
3. Supplies and Materials	$ 5,000.00	$ 1,000.00	$ 1,000.00	$ 1,000.00	$ 1,000.00	$ 1,000.00	$ 10,000.00
4. Telecommunications							$ -
5. Training							$ -
6. Travel	$ 10,000.00	$ 12,500.00	$ 12,500.00	$ 12,500.00	$ 12,500.00	$ 12,500.00	$ 72,500.00
7. Other Operating Costs							$ -
8. Capital Expenditures							
8.1 Hardware	$ 50,000.00	$ 10,000.00	$ 10,000.00	$ 10,000.00	$ 10,000.00	$ 10,000.00	$ 100,000.00
8.2 Software	$ 100,000.00	$ 23,000.00	$ 23,000.00	$ 23,000.00	$ 23,000.00	$ 23,000.00	$ 215,000.00
TOTAL COSTS	$ 6,377,369.00	$ 1,040,112.00	$ 790,112.00	$ 800,000.00	$ 810,000.00	$ 810,000.00	$ 10,627,593.00
General Funds	$ 2,073,714.00	$ 290,112.00	$ 290,112.00	$ 300,000.00	$ 310,000.00	$ 310,000.00	$ 3,573,938.00
Cash Funds	$ 250,000.00	$ 250,000.00		$ 500,000.00			$ 1,000,000.00
Federal Funds	$ 4,053,925.00	$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00		$ 500,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ 6,053,925.00
TOTAL FUNDS	$ 6,377,639.00	$ 1,040,112.00	$ 790,112.00	$ 800,000.00	$ 810,000.00	$ 810,000.00	$ 10,627,863.00

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Biennial Budget - FY2003-05

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	**Mean**	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	13	14	14	13.7	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	20	24	20	21.3	25
V: Technical Impact	18	18	18	18.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	9	9	8.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	9	9	9	9.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	16	18	20	18.0	20
			TOTAL	**88**	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer 1:

- The score would have been higher if the proposal had focused more on those initiatives to be undertaken with this budget request.

Reviewer 2:

- Score is based on the quality of the planning and review process already in place for CJIS. Lack of detailed information on specific projects in this request is mitigated by documentation and review process used for CJIS projects.
- Federal funds are the primary source for project funding.

Reviewer 3:
Strengths

- Excellent summary of CJIS project history, investment, strategy and scope. and priority This project is clearly and priority for the Crime Commission and important to Nebraska.
- Good justification of project in broad terms.
- CJIS clearly represents progress in data sharing.
- Good summary of stakeholders and milestones
- Risks have been identified
- Budget appears sound assuming general funds, cash funds and federal funds are available.

Weaknesses

- Lack of detail for the major investment categories of planning and programming and clarity of what capabilities for CJIS are current versus planned.
- Weak in projecting the estimate of financial and community safety payback. How many investigations per year save 45 minutes to 2hours - what is the "effectiveness" increase from access to more data? How many law enforcement agencies are targeted to use CJIS? How many small police departments. What new capabilities are enabled?
- It is not clear how the software examples given will be integrated into the CJIS technical architecture nor how broadly they will be implemented in Nebraska.
- It is not clear where the bulk of the FY2003-2004 expenses - $ 900,000 for design and programming are going.
- Local applications and integration will continue to be challenges for CJIS.

DRAFT
(Date of Last Revision: November 4, 2002)

Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Progress Report To The Governor and Legislature

November 15, 2002

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The Legislature established the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC) in 1998 to provide advice, strategic direction, and accountability on information technology investments in the state. Section 86-518 directs the NITC to submit a progress report to the Governor and Legislature by November 15 of each even-numbered year. This report is offered in fulfillment of that requirement.

To achieve its mandate, the NITC relies on coordination and collaboration to influence a wide range of information technology issues. The NITC has neither operational authority nor enforcement powers for implementing its policy directives. The NITC has adhered to the legislative directive in Section 86-513 to "coordinate the state's investment in information technology in an efficient and expeditious manner. The provisions (of Sections 86-512 to 86-524) are not intended to impede the raid deployment of appropriate technology or establish cumbersome regulations or bureaucracy."

The NITC has focused its efforts on the four goals listed in the Statewide Technology Plan:

1. Support the development of a robust statewide telecommunications infrastructure that is scalable, reliable, and efficient;
2. Support the use of information technology to enhance community and economic development;
3. Promote the use of information technology to improve the efficiency and delivery of governmental and educational services, including Homeland Security;
4. Promote effective planning, management and accountability regarding the state's investments in information technology.

There has been substantial progress in each of these areas.

Regarding the first goal, the NITC is promoting aggregation of bandwidth and sharing networks across governmental and educational entities. In 1999, the NITC co-sponsored the Telecommunications Infrastructure Needs Assessment (TINA) Study. In 2001, after proposals for a statewide networking infrastructure failed to meet the state's requirements, the NITC met with industry representatives to identify problems and options.

In February 2002, the NITC endorsed a pilot project to test some of the concepts of aggregation. The Scottsbluff pilot project succeeded in bringing cost savings to participants and forging an effective coalition between the University and State Government. That coalition is now expanding its membership and has begun work on the initial segments of a "core routing network" that will serve as the backbone for statewide aggregation. In 2002, the NITC also sponsored the Nebraska Network Feasibility Study to examine a wide range of network sharing issues that go beyond aggregation of raw bandwidth. In September, the NITC adopted the findings and

recommendations of that study, which provide strategic direction on major areas that affect network management.

The NITC's second goal concerns the use of information technology to enhance community and economic development. The NITC has developed strategies and resources in the form of the Community Information Technology Toolkit. A companion workbook provides a planning guide and a comprehensive assessment tool. The NITC is now providing financial and technical assistance to eight communities, which will undertake community IT planning efforts. The NITC has co-sponsored several regional conferences and helped organize sessions on community IT development at statewide conferences. The NITC also provides staff support for the Telehealth Subcommittee, which provides a forum for members to share ideas and coordinate their efforts.

The NITC's Community Technology Fund has provided financial assistance to 40 local projects. Grant projects range from a joint library automation system, which saved three libraries thousands of dollars, to a technology business incubator.

The third goal of the NITC is to promote the use of information technology to improve the efficiency and delivery of governmental and educational services, including Homeland Security. Using grants from the State Records Board, The Chief Information Officer and Nebrask@ Online have worked together to revamp and enhance the availability of government information and services over the Internet. The Business Portal (**www.nebraska.gov/business/**) provides convenient access to all business-related services and information, including a searchable database of 1200 business-related forms of state agencies. The CIO and Nebrask@ Online are now collaborating on automating forms, developing interactive license renewal applications, providing an online payment portal, making further enhancements to the business portal, and creating both a citizens portal and an education portal.

The NITC has also co-sponsored the annual conference on e-government and special events pertaining to security and accessibility. The State Government Collaboration Fund has provided financing for several small projects.

Promoting effective planning, management, and accountability for spending on information technology has been the NITC's fourth area of emphasis. The NITC has put in place requirements for agency comprehensive information technology plans and project level plans. The NITC has adopted standards and guidelines in several areas, including accessibility, security policies, and video standards for synchronous distance learning and video conferencing.

In addition to adopting project management guidelines, the NITC has implemented project status reporting for large projects. Pursuant to State Statute, the CIO is monitoring selected projects.

The remainder of this report provides additional details on progress toward each of the NITC's goals. It also discusses the NITC Clearinghouse and includes summary information on several benchmarks for evaluating the state's progress compared to other states and the nation as a whole.

Biennial Legislative Review

The Legislature established the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC) in 1998 to provide advice, strategic direction, and accountability on information technology investments in the state. Section 86-518 directs the NITC to submit a progress report to the Governor and Legislature by November 15 of each even-numbered year. This report is offered in fulfillment of that requirement.

Section 86-524 further directs the Appropriations Committee and Transportation and Telecommunications Committee to conduct a joint review of the activities of the NITC by the end of the calendar year of every even-numbered year. Section 86-524 also provides three objectives and a list of criteria for evaluating progress. This report is intended to provide information to assist the Legislature in conducting its review.

Policy objectives (Section 86-524)
"It shall be the policy of the state to:

1. Use information technology in education, communities, including health care and economic development, and every level of government service to improve economic opportunities and quality of life for all Nebraskans regardless of location or income;
2. Stimulate the demand to encourage and enable long-term infrastructure innovation and improvement; and
3. Organize technology planning in new ways to aggregate demand, reduce costs, and create support networks; encourage collaboration between communities of interest; and encourage competition among technology and service providers."

Review Criteria (Section 86-524):
"In the review, the committees shall determine the extent to which:

1. The vision has been realized and short-term and long-term strategies have been articulated and employed;
2. The statewide technology plan and other activities of the commission have improved coordination and assisted policymakers;
3. An information technology clearinghouse has been established, maintained, and utilized of Nebraska's information technology infrastructure and of activities taking place in the state involving information technology, and the information flow between and among individuals and organizations has been facilitated as a result of the information technology clearinghouse;
4. Policies, standards, guidelines, and architectures have been developed and observed;

5. Recommendations made by the commission to the Governor and Legislature have assisted policy and funding decisions;
6. Input and involvement of all interested parties has been encouraged and facilitated; and
7. Long-term infrastructure innovation, improvement, and coordination has been planned for, facilitated, and achieved with minimal barriers and impediments."

Structure

The NITC consists of nine members, including one member representing elementary and secondary education, one member representing postsecondary education, one member representing communities, one member representing the Governor, and five members representing the general public who have experience in developing strategic plans and making high-level business decisions. The Lt. Governor serves as the Governor's designee and is the chair of the NITC.

Pursuant to Section 86-516 (7) and 86-521, the NITC conducts most of its work through the Community Council, Education Council, State Government Council, and Technical Panel. Each council establishes ad hoc work groups to prepare recommendations on specific topics. Agendas and minutes of the Councils and Technical Panel, including reports on the activities of ad hoc work groups, are available at www.nitc.state.ne.us.

The Office of the Chief Information Officer provides support for the NITC, its Councils, the Technical Panel and ad hoc groups. The Governor appoints the Chief Information Officer, who reports directly to the Lt. Governor.

NITC Vision And Goals

NITC Vision Statement
Promote the use of information technology in education, health care, economic development, and all levels of government services to improve the quality of life of all Nebraskans.

NITC Goals

1. Support the development of a robust statewide telecommunications infrastructure that is scalable, reliable, and efficient;
2. Support the use of information technology to enhance community and economic development;
3. Promote the use of information technology to improve the efficiency and delivery of governmental and educational services, including Homeland Security;
4. Promote effective planning, management and accountability regarding the state's investments in information technology.

Statewide Technology Plan

Section 86-516 requires the NITC to prepare an annual statewide technology plan. The most recent version is located on the NITC web site, www.nitc.state.ne.us. In addition to the vision statement and goals, the statewide technology plan provides specific objectives and action items. Separate sections in the statewide technology plan address the topics of:

- NITC Vision And Goals
- Council Priorities And Action Items
- Technical Infrastructure
- Planning And Project Management
- Effectiveness Measures

The 2002 Statewide Technology Plan serves as a blueprint to guide and evaluate the efforts of the NITC.

Progress Toward Goal 1

Goal: Support the development of a robust statewide telecommunications infrastructure that is scalable, reliable, and efficient.

The NITC is promoting aggregation of bandwidth and sharing networks as the primary strategy for improving telecommunications in Nebraska. Collectively, state and local government, higher education, and K-12 educational entities represent a huge market for voice, video and data communications. By coordinating purchases of telecommunications services and decisions on technical requirements, publicly funded entities have the power to influence the state's telecommunications infrastructure. This covers a full range of issues for participating entities, including lower costs, deployment of new technology, statewide coverage and quality of service.

In 1999 - 2000, the NITC co-sponsored the Telecommunications Infrastructure Needs Assessment (TINA) Study with the Division of Communications (DOC). The TINA Study inventoried current telecommunications demand and projected future needs of government agencies and educational institutions. In 2001, the DOC acted on behalf of the NITC and in collaboration with potential stakeholders to issue a request for proposal (RFP). The NETCOM (Nebraska Telecommunications Network) RFP invited bids to implement advanced broadband technology throughout the state with an extensive distribution of regional and local aggregation points. Had it been successful, the NETCOM RFP would have provided a robust telecommunications infrastructure that was scalable and reliable. It would have permitted easy sharing of networks among public entities, while providing communities and businesses independent access to the same technology. In October 2001, the DOC rejected all five bids as too expensive and not responsive to the RFP requirements. Each vendor proposed to build a costly private network for the exclusive use of the state and any partners it represented.

The NETCOM RFP tried to accomplish more than was feasible, given the circumstances. It would have required major new investments by providers, without an adequate level of business to insure a positive return on investment, because the DOC could only guarantee a level of demand for state agencies. The concept of postalized rates, the extensive distribution of aggregation points, and the requirement for a major network operations center represented additional significant costs and risks to providers.

Looking for an alternate approach, the NITC approved the concept of a pilot project for aggregating bandwidth in February 2002. Subsequently, the DOC and the University of Nebraska combined their video and data traffic from Grand Island to Scottsbluff by sharing a single DS3 line. Qwest is the long haul carrier, while Sprint Local Service distributes the traffic to the "last mile". Benefits of the pilot project include:

- Demonstrating that the University and the State (through DOC) have formed an effective working coalition for aggregating telecommunications services;
- Overall cost savings of 10 to 15%;
- Service improvement to users;
- Some scalability by creating the ability for fractional services (above 56kps) and providing a limited amount of excess capacity for future growth.

Another positive outcome of the Scottsbluff pilot project was formalizing the working relationship between the University and DOC by creating the "Collaborative Aggregation Partnership". The purpose of the partnership is to serve as the operational entity for network design, bandwidth aggregation, and contract management. The Nebraska Educational Telecommunications has been added as a member. Other partners will be included as needed. This partnership is now designing a core routing network that would form the basis for sharing data traffic, with an initial focus oneducational entities. This would be the first phase of an evolving effort to aggregate most publicly funded Internet traffic and provide shared networks.

Another spin-off of the Scottsbluff pilot project has been increased interest in many sectors of the telecommunications industry in responding to the demand for statewide aggregation and more cost-effective services. This interest is reflected both in several meetings with state officials and within the industry.

In February 2002, the NITC also started the Nebraska Network Feasibility Study. TINA, NETCOM, and the Scottsbluff pilot project have focused on aggregating raw bandwidth. In contrast, the purpose of the Nebraska Network Workgroup was to examine the benefits and problems related to sharing the applications that run on networks. The workgroup submitted its final report to the NITC in September 2002. The findings included a listing of the substantial costs, shortcomings, andstrengths of existing regional and statewide single-purpose networks. The recommendations underscored the need for bandwidth aggregation and a statewide core routing network. Other recommendations called for:

- Developing a shared IP-centric network primarily serving educational and other interested entities;
- Preparing a plan to implement a statewide synchronous video network;

- Evaluating other opportunities for sharing applications that would benefit all levels of education;
- Researching options for long-term management and operation for aggregation and sharing networks.

These and other recommendations provide strategic direction to guide future efforts. Copies of the final report and related information are available at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/network/.

Progress Toward Goal 2

Goal: Support the use of information technology to enhance community and economic development.

The Community Council of the NITC has promoted the use of information technology to enhance community and economic development by building partnerships, developing resources on information technology-related development, providing assistance to communities, organizing workshops, and providing grants for community technology projects. The Community Council also sponsors the Telehealth Subcommittee, which provides a forum for discussion and coordination on topics of mutual interest.

Building Partnerships. The NITC has partnered with the University of Nebraska and the Technologies Across Nebraska initiative on a number of projects. By developing strong partnerships, the NITC has been better able to leverage its resources and to coordinate the delivery of information technology development programming.

Developing Toolkit Resources. In partnership with the University of Nebraska and the Technologies Across Nebraska, the NITC has developed a Community Information Technology Toolkit. The toolkit is available at www.nitc.state.ne.us or from technologiesacrossnebraska.unl.edu. The toolkit contains strategies and resources, frequently asked questions (FAQs), reading lists, and contact information related to information technology-related development.

The *Community Information Technology Planning and Assessment Workbook* is the newest addition to the toolkit. The workbook includes a detailed planning guide, a nine-question quiz to determine a community's level of e-readiness, and a comprehensive assessment tool.

Providing Assistance to Communities. This fall, eight communities have begun piloting the *Community Information Technology Planning and Assessment Workbook* and other toolkit materials. The eight communities are:

- Alliance
- Brown/Keya Paha/Rock Counties
- Custer County
- Crawford-Harrison
- Edgar

- Fillmore County
- West Point
- York County

Each community is eligible to receive up to $2,500 to support their planning efforts. Participating communities are receiving support from the NITC, the University of Nebraska Cooperative Extension, and Technologies Across Nebraska partners.

Organizing Conferences and Workshops. Through several conferences and workshops, the NITC has provided education and training on information technology-related development.

On April 12, 2002, a conference on information technology planning and development was held in Aurora, Nebraska. The conference was organized by the NITC, in partnership with the University of Nebraska and Technologies Across Nebraska. Other sponsors included Governor Mike Johanns, the Nebraska Department of Economic Development, the Nebraska Public Service Commission, and the Nebraska Rural Development Commission. Speakers included Lt. Governor Dave Heineman, Al Wenstrand , director of the Nebraska Department of Economic Development; Congressman Tom Osborne; and rural telecommunications advocate Jane Leonard. Approximately 135 individuals from 43 Nebraska communities participated in the conference. Conference evaluations indicated that the conference effectively provided information and training on technology-related development:

- Ninety-six percent of the participants indicated that attending the conference helped them understand the importance of IT-related community and economic development.

- Ninety-one percent of the participants indicated that attending the conference helped them understand how to begin incorporating information technology into local community and economic development processes.

On September 24, 2002, a workshop on preparing applications for the USDA Rural Utilities Service Community Connect broadband grant program was offered. The workshop was organized by the NITC in partnership with the University of Nebraska, Technologies Across Nebraska, and the USDA Rural Utilities Service. The workshop was available at satellite downlink sites across the state and via streaming video from the Technologies Across Nebraska Web site.

In addition, NITC staff has helped to organize sessions on IT development at several statewide conferences including the Nebraska Rural Institute, the League of Nebraska Municipalities Annual Meeting, and the Nebraska Development Network Annual meeting.

Providing Grants for Community Technology Projects. Since September 1998, 40 projects have received a total of $834,200 from the Nebraska Information Technology Commission's Community Technology Fund. The projects funded demonstrate how

information technology is being used to improve efficiency and enhance economic development. Grant projects range from a joint library automation system which saved three libraries thousands of dollars to a technology business incubator. Information on projects funded in 2000 and 2001 is available at http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/cc/grants/2002/CTF0102report.pdf .

In 2002, eleven projects received grants totaling $191,060.06 from the Community Technology Fund:

- **The City of Ashland** will purchase a LaserFiche system to scan all city documents into a format which provides more convenient access to the public. (Award: $7,629)

- **Sarpy County** will develop a county-wide GIS land base map which will enhance the accessibility of information to local government departments, decision-makers, and the public. (Award: $25,000).

- **LaVista Public Library** will offer basic scanning classes to library patrons, community members, and staff of Metropolitan Community College's Sarpy Center and the City of LaVista. (Award: $3,612.06)

- **Cherry County Hospital** will install an interactive video system which will provide access to medical and educational programming and will support the development of telehealth services in Cherry County. (Award: $11,136)

- **Valley County Hospital** will expand access to medical and educational programming in the area by developing an interactive video/distance learning center. (Award: $19,623)

- **Omaha Public Library** will make government more accessible by placing a library kiosk with links to city, county, and state government Web sites as well as career information and library collections. (Award: $25,000)

- **The City of Aurora** will demonstrate that smaller Nebraska communities can economically implement GIS by using the digital databases already compiled by other public and private agencies and organizations. (Award: $25,000)

- **Central Community College** will enhance general education and job skills training by installing computers in 6 learning centers in economically depressed counties. (Award: $18,518)

- **University of Nebraska Cooperative Extension** will assist eight Nebraska communities or regions in the development of technology plans. Participating communities will be eligible for mini grants to support their planning activities. (Award: $20,000)

- **Franklin County Memorial Hospital** will convert medical records into an electronic form, accessible through encrypted Internet services to qualified practitioners at any of the five sites operated by the hospital. (Award: $22,292)

- **The City of South Sioux City** will create wireless access points at ten strategically identified areas in the community. This project will enable the city to provide more efficient services to its citizens. (Award: $13,250)

Progress Toward Goal 3

*Goal: **Promote the use of information technology to improve the efficiency and delivery of governmental and educational services, including Homeland Security.***

In November 2000, the NITC adopted the e-government strategy developed by the State Government Council. The report set forth a vision, goal, and measurable objectives for planning and implementing e-government projects, including access to government information and services by businesses, citizens, and employees. Governor Johanns also endorsed the e-government strategy and called for immediate work on an initiative that focused on the interaction of business with state and local agencies. The Business Portal Action Plan (March 2001) set forth short and long term steps to provide a single point of access, self-service, and integration across agency boundaries and political jurisdictions.

Using a grant from the State Records Board to the CIO, Nebrask@ Online developed the Nebrask@ Online For Business website (www.nebraska.gov/business/). The business portal includes the following key features:

- A searchable inventory of all business-related forms of state agencies, which number more than 1200;
- The ability to download the highest volume forms (1,000+ submissions per year);
- A secure procedure for maintaining a personal database of forms unique to each user ("My Portfolio");
- Convenient access to all business-related services and information;
- Current business related news releases from agencies and development organizations;
- Links to a wide range of business development resources.

Using a second grant from the State Records Board to the CIO, Nebrask@ Online is now working on enhancements to the state's business portal. Phase II of the business portal will implement a method to maintain the accuracy of the forms inventory database. Nebrask@ Online will also conduct training sessions with businesses across the state to promote the business portal and explain how to use it. Phase II also includes funding to automate forms.

Use of Nebrask@ Online for Business has grown steadily since its introduction last spring. Over a four-month period, the number of hits increased from 68,000 in May to

178,000 in August. Usage will continue to grow as more businesses become aware of this service and as the website has more to offer.

Making maximum use of the State Records Board grants, Nebrask@ Online and the CIO are collaborating on three other projects. The Interactive License Renewal Initiative will establish a web site for all license renewal applications and fund up to five interactive license renewal applications. The intent is to use this initiative as a pilot project to develop the most cost-effective approach for fully automating forms of all agencies. Another joint project is developing an online payment portal that all agencies can use for applications that offer payment by credit card, electronic check or similar means. The third initiative will create a citizen's portal that will provide "one-stop shop" for government services at the local, county, and state levels that are of interest to citizens. In addition to increasing the ease of access to existing information and services, this project will identify and implement new features.

Other agencies have undertaken projects, which enhance the goal of e-government. The Secretary of State and Nebrask@ Online are putting all agency rules and regulations online in a searchable format. They are also developing a system to track the progress of proposed changes to rules and regulations. Under the leadership of the Nebraska Crime Commission, state and local criminal justice entities are building one of the best criminal justice information systems in the nation, which shares data across all jurisdictions. The court automation system that is in use in all but one of the state's county and district courts is nationally recognized for its accomplishments. The Supreme Court continues to enhance this system, with plans for Internet access to court records, Internet payment of traffic tickets, and e-filing. The NFOCUS system at the Department of Health and Human Services consistently ranks in the top 10 nationally, because it integrates the eligibility process for 26 different programs and gives caseworkers statewide access to the same information. The Department of Revenue also ranks in the top 10 states, in terms of its use of technology. Over 20% of state tax returns filed this year were filed electronically. Over 10% of Nebraska employers are already using the Department of Labor's new system for electronically filing quarterly Unemployment Insurance Tax and Wage Reports. The Department of Motor Vehicles is installing both an interactive drivers license system and on-line temporary registration system for motor carriers.

In the area of Homeland Security, the CIO and the GIS Steering Committee are developing recommendations regarding the use of geographic information systems to support the needs of the Nebraska Emergency Management Agency. The final report will determine priorities and options for cooperative implementation.

The Education Council has sponsored several recent efforts to improve the efficiency and delivery of educational services, using electronic means. These include:

- Developing an education portal in cooperation with Nebrask@ Online. When completed the education portal will provide a central point of access to a full range of information and services available from educational institutions in Nebraska.

- Developing a policy on course cancellation fees for the NEBSAT system. The course cancellation fees encourage better utilization of distance education resources.
- Facilitating a cooperative purchasing agreement of computers and software through the Midwest Higher Education Consortium.

The State Government Technology Collaboration Fund ….

State agencies have undertaken several major information technology projects that significantly impact daily operations and delivery of information and services. In particular, The Department of Administrative Services is sponsoring the Nebraska Information System, which will automate most financial and human resource functions. The NIS will replace the state government's accounting and payroll systems with an integrated enterprise management system. The Department of Health and Human Services and the State Treasurer recently implemented fundamental changes to the information technology systems that provide the foundation for child support collection, distribution, and enforcement in Nebraska. DHHS is also making major changes to its Medicaid Management Information System and other automated systems to comply with federal requirements governing health information. The Nebraska Public Employees Retirement System is automating many of its procedures. These are just a few examples of agencies using information technology to improve the efficiency and delivery of governmental services.

Conferences are another method for promoting the use of information technology within state government. The NITC has co-sponsored and helped organize the following events:

- Annual E-Government Conferences (1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002);
- Accessibility Conference(Date?)
- Security Awareness Day (July 15, 2002).

Progress Toward Goal 4

Goal: Promote effective planning, management and accountability regarding the state's investments in information technology.

The Information Technology Infrastructure Act underscores the Legislature's interest in effective planning, management and accountability for information technology investments. Section 86-516 (5) directs the NITC to adopt guidelines regarding project planning, management, and technical reviews. Section 86-516 (8) requires the NITC to "… make recommendations to the Governor and Legislature, including a prioritized list of projects, reviewed by the technical panel, for which new or additional funding is requested." Section 86-520 (5) requires the Chief Information Officer to "implement a strategic, tactical, and project planning process for non-education state government information technology that is linked to the budget process." Section 86-520 (9) requires the Chief Information Officer to "monitor the status of major non-education state government technology projects." Section 86-521 requires the Technical Panel to "review

any technology project or request for additional funding recommended to the Nebraska Information Technology Commission." Section 86-516 (6) directs the NITC to "adopt minimum technical standards, guidelines, and architectures upon recommendation by the Technical Panel."

In addition, Sections 86-525 through 86-530 establishes the Information Technology Infrastructure Fund and assigns additional responsibilities to the NITC and CIO. These duties include approving project plans and monitoring the status of projects.

To meet these statutory directives the NITC and CIO have implemented the following procedures and activities:

- Agency Comprehensive Information Technology Plans;
- Information technology project proposal requirements;
- NITC prioritization of budget requests for new or additional funding for information technology;
- Technical Panel project reviews;
- Technical standards and guidelines;
- Project Management Guidelines and Project Status Reporting Requirements;
- Monitoring of selected large-scale enterprise projects.

Agency Comprehensive Information Technology Plans. Prior to developing their biennial budget requests, state agencies must submit comprehensive information technology plans to the NITC. The plans document existing applications, databases, computer systems and networks. They also indicate the degree to which agencies are implementing NITC standards and guidelines. A section in the plans summarizes future strategies and projects. Copies of agency comprehensive information technology plans and summary information based on the plans are available at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/itc/sg.htm.

Information Technology Project Proposal Requirements. The project proposal form is intended to project sufficient information about a project to determine its scope, merits, technical impact, risks, and budget. The form is used for biennial budget requests for information technology projects and NITC grant requests. A copy of the form is available at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/forms/.

Budget Reviews and Prioritization . The review and prioritization process used in 2000 and 2002 was thorough, structured, and produced an integrated and numeric ranking of budget requests for information technology. Both the Budget Division and Legislative Fiscal Office use the NITC reviews and priorities as a point of departure for their own analyses.

Technical Panel Project Reviews. By statute, the Technical Panel is required to review and provide technical analysis for a number of information technology related projects and requests. The panel has reviewed 51(??) budget requests for information technology projects totaling more than $16.5 (??) million; 126 Community Technology Fund grant requests; and 21 Government Technology Collaboration Fund grant requests. The panel has also provided technical reviews of projects receiving state funds from the

Information Technology Infrastructure Fund. These projects include the NETCOM telecommunications project; the Public Safety Wireless System project; the Crime Commission's NCJIS project; and the NIS project.

Technical project reviews were also conducted for 11 grant requests from the State Records Board; requests from the Education Innovation Fund competitive grants; and the Department of Education's School Renovation Technology Grants. The Technical Panel has heard special presentations on other existing and proposed projects asking for voluntary technical reviews.

Technical Standards and Guidelines. Since its inception, the Technical Panel and the NITC have worked steadily on developing technical standards and guidelines. The purpose of these standards and guidelines is to establish policy, improve compatibility of systems, and increase efficiency. Since the NITC has no regulatory authority, implementation of standards and guidelines depends on voluntary compliance based on shared values or self-interest. All standards and guidelines go through an extensive public process of development and adoption. They are posted on the NITC website at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/index.html. The NITC has adopted the following standards and guidelines:

- Accessibility -- technology access clause for state contracts; Accessibility Policy; Accessibility Checklists;
- E-mail standards for state agencies;
- Hardware -- Workstation guidelines (minimum configurations) for state agencies and K-12 educational entities;
- Security – Security Policies (Information Security Management; Access Control; Disaster Recovery; Education, Training and Awareness; Individual Use; Network Security; Security Breaches and Incident Reporting); security planning resource documents (Security Officer Instruction Guide; IS Technical Staff Handbook; Computer Users' Security Handbook); and incident reporting procedures;
- Video -- Video and audio compression standards for synchronous distance learning and video conferencing;

Work is in progress on disaster planning guidelines, training for accessibility issues, a secure e-mail solution for state agencies, technical requirements for the network architecture, and an implementation plan for integrating synchronous video networks.

Project Management Guidelines and Project Status Reporting Requirements. The Statewide Technology Plan endorsed the Project Management Institute's Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK). The first implementation was a requirement for selected projects to submit quarterly project status reports, using a standard format. Seven agencies reported on a total of 25 projects during the last reporting period. Copies of the project status reports are available on a password-protected web site: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/itpm/.

Project Monitoring. Section 86-516(6) directs the Chief Information Officer to "monitor the status of major non-educational state government technology projects." The quarterly project status reports represent one method for meeting this responsibility. In addition, the CIO chairs the CHARTS / SDU Integration Steering Committee and the

HHSS HIPAA Steering Committee. The CIO also managed the contract for the federally mandated IVV (Independent Verification and Validation) review of the CHARTS project. The CIO is a member of the NIS Steering Committee and participates in a management-level oversight group.

NITC Clearinghouse

The information technology Infrastructure Act makes four references to an information technology clearinghouse. Section 86-508 defines an information technology clearinghouse as a "service to provide convenient access for the commission and general public to information about best technology practices, referrals for technical assistance, and other information related to the Information Technology Infrastructure Act. Section 86-513 establishes legislative intent that, "A clearinghouse should be formed for technical support and best practices information." Section 86-516 directs the NITC to "Create an information technology clearinghouse to identify and share best practices and new developments, as well as identify existing problems and deficiencies." Finally, Section 86-524 directs the Appropriations Committee and Transportation and Telecommunications Committee to evaluate progress on whether "An information technology clearinghouse has been established, maintained, and utilized of Nebraska's information technology infrastructure and of activities taking place in the state involving information technology, and the information flow between and among individuals and organizations has been facilitated as a result of the information technology clearinghouse."

The NITC has used the Internet as the most economical means for providing an information technology clearinghouse. The NITC's web site (www.nitc.state.ne.us) is organized as a clearinghouse. It provides access to an extensive amount of information including resources for communities, educational entities, and state government. There is also a section for citizens, which will be greatly expanded as part of the citizen portal project of Nebrask@ Online. The section on community resources includes topics such as "Best practices and resources for community leadership and IT planning," and "funding strategies." The NITC website is the official repository for agenda, minutes, and documents for the NITC, its councils and their workgroups. The section on "Technical Architecture" provides access to all technical standards and guidelines adopted by the NITC or under development.

In addition to the clearinghouse, the NITC publishes a monthly electronic newsletter, *NITC.news*, which provides current information on information technology issues and developments. The current readership is 900. It includes public officials, community leaders, educational personnel, and interested persons. Past copies of *NITC.news* are available on the NITC website.

Effectiveness Measures

Overview

The overall purpose of the NITC is to set strategic direction in the area of information technology. This requires knowledge of where we are as well as where we want to be. Section 1 (Goals) sets forth a vision with supporting objectives and priorities. This section presents various ways to track the state's strength in its deployment and use of information technology. The scorecard includes various measures for communities, education, and government.

The NITC must also track its own effectiveness. This is accomplished in part through the choice of NITC objectives, Council priorities, and action plans that have measurable outcomes. To track progress, the Office of the CIO prepares status reports on NITC-sponsored activities. These reports will be available on the NITC web site at: www.nitc.state.ne.us.

Community Information Technology Effectiveness Measures

Community Indicators

There are few sources, which regularly document the use of information technology by communities or households by state. The U.S. Department of Commerce periodically publishes reports examining Internet access based on data collected by the U.S. Census Bureau. In the last two reports published by the Department of Commerce, Nebraska was slightly below the national average in the percentage of households with Internet access. The most recent report, *A Nation Online: How Americans Are Expanding Their Use of the Internet*, is available at http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/dn/index.html .

Percent of Households with Internet Access

	2000[1]	**2001**[2]
Nebraska	37.0%	45.5%
National Average	41.5%	50.5%

Economic Indicators

There are several studies, which have examined economic indicators of states and metropolitan areas. A recent study by the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City found that, when the

[1] *Falling Through the Net*. National Telecommunications and Infrastructure Administration. August 2000
[2] *A Nation Online: How Americans are Expanding Their Use of the Internet*. National Telecommunications and Infrastructure Administration. February 2001

geographic dispersion of the region's population is taken into account, the states comprising the Tenth District (Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Nebraska, Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma) are quite high tech. In comparison to other metropolitan areas of similar sizes, both Lincoln and Omaha rank above the national average in both percent of workers in high-tech occupations and in the percent of workers in high-tech industries.

Metropolitan Area	% of workers in high-tech occupations, 2000	% of workers in high-tech industries, 1999
Omaha	6.7	5.1
Lincoln	6.6	2.7

Source: Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, Economic Review, Second Quarter 2002 (www.kcfrb.org)

The State New Economy Index is an often-cited study of the ability of states to compete in the new economy. Nebraska fares well on some measures, including information technology jobs, education level of the manufacturing workforce, export focus of manufacturing, digital government, online agriculture, broadband telecommunications, and high-tech jobs. The 2002 State New Economy Index for Nebraska follows.

The 2002 State New Economy Index

http://www.neweconomyindex.org/states/2002/index.html

A. Nebraska

Indicator	Rank	Score
Overall*	**33**	54.35
Aggregated Knowledge Jobs	**26**	9.91
Information Technology Jobs *Employment in IT occupations in non-IT industries as a share of total jobs.*	**21**	1.6%
Managerial, Professional & Tech Jobs *Managers, professionals, and technicians as a share of the total workforce.*	**27**	25.3%
Workforce Education *A weighted measure of the educational attainment (advanced degrees, bachelor's degrees, associate degrees, or some college course work) of the workforce.*	**34**	46.6
Education Level of the Manufacturing Workforce *A weighted measure of the educational attainment of the manufacturing workforce.*	**5**	1.56
Aggregated Globalization Score	**40**	8.71
Export Focus Of Manufacturing *Manufacturing export sales per manufacturing worker.*	**23**	$33,079
Foreign Direct Investment *The percentage of each state's workforce employed by foreign companies.*	**45**	2.8%
Aggregated Economic Dynamism Scores	**41**	7.80
"Gazelle" Jobs *Jobs in gazelle companies (companies with annual sales revenue that has*	**32**	12.8%

grown 20 percent or more for four straight years) as a share of total employment.		
Job Churning *The number of new start-ups and business failures, combined, as a share of all establishments in each state.*	**45**	16.9%
Initial Public Offerings *A weighted measure of the value and number of initial public stock offerings of companies as a share of gross state product.*	**28**	4.31
Aggregated Digital Economy Scores	**18**	10.98
Online Population *The percentage of adults with Internet access in each state.*	**28**	55.4%
Commercial Internet Domain Names *The number of commercial Internet domain names (".com") per firm.*	**42**	0.41
Technology in Schools *A weighted measure of five factors measuring computer and internet use in schools.*	**1**	3.82
Digital Government *A measure of the utilization of digital technologies in state governments.*	**22**	3.18
Online Agriculture *A measure of the percentage of farmers with Internet access and who use computers for business.*	**22**	3.10
Online Manufacturers *The percentage of manufacturing establishments with Internet access.*	**31**	84.6%
Broadband Telecommunications *A measure of the use and deployment of broadband telecommunications infrastructure over telephone lines.*	**12**	3.62
Aggregated Innovation Capacity	**34**	7.66
High-Tech Jobs *Jobs in electronics manufacturing, software and computer-related services, telecommunications, and biomedical as a share of total employment.*	**19**	4.9%
Scientists and Engineers *Civilian scientists and engineers as a percentage of the workforce.*	**40**	0.33%
Patents *The number of patents issued to companies or individuals per 1,000 workers.*	**41**	0.34
Industry Investment in R&D *Industry investment in research and development as a percentage of Gross State Product (GSP).*	**42**	0.42%
Venture Capital *Venture capital invested as a percentage of GSP.*	**35**	0.16%

* Because of differences in methodology, changes in ranks between 1999 and 2002 cannot all be attributed to changes in actual economic conditions in the state.

Education Information Technology Effectiveness Measures

Education Technology Statistics

Although Nebraska's ratio of the number of students per computer has improved in almost every case, other states have made faster headway by providing even more computers using increased funding. With the decreased allotments from the Education Innovation Fund and the Technology Challenge Literacy Fund for new technology, Nebraska's ranking may continue to decline. Nebraska's Internet access has improved relative to the rest of the country by deploying more T-1 to public schools over the past two years.

Category	Year	National Average	Nebraska Average	Rank
Students Per Instructional Computer	1999	5.7	3.9	2
	2001	4.9	3.7	5
	2002	4.2	3.1	6
Students Per Instructional Multimedia Computer	1999	9.8	7.1	3
	2001	7.9	7.1	5
	2002	6.9	6.0	16
Students Per Internet-connected Computer	1999	13.6	7.2	3
	2001	7.9	5.1	5
	2002	6.8	4.6	3
Of those schools with Internet Access, the % that connect using T-1, cable modem, or faster	1999	56%	49%	30
	2001	67%	77%	7
	2002	72%	69%	29

Government Information Technology Effectiveness Measures

Digital State Survey

For three years, the Center for Digital Government, The Progress & Freedom Foundation, and Government Technology Magazine have conducted a detailed survey of digital government in all 50 states. Nebraska's overall score in 1999/2000 was 14. Nebraska scored relatively well in five categories. In 2001, the Digital State Survey made important changes in content and verification procedures. Detailed rankings are provided only for states that rank in the upper half. Nebraska's standing was 17th overall, with a top-ten ranking in three categories. In 2002, Nebraska's ranking dropped in four categories and increased in three. A comparison of Nebraska's ranking for the past three years is below:

Digital State Survey Results			
Category	2000 Ranking	2001 Ranking	2002 Ranking
Electronic Commerce / Business Regulation	28	25	Unranked (>25th)
Taxation / Revenue	29	9 (tie)	1 (tied)
Law Enforcement / Courts	12	Unranked (> 25th)	Unranked (> 25th)
Social Services	9	5 (tie)	7 (tie)
Digital Democracy	13	3	17
Management / Admin.	10	22	Unranked (>25th)
Education	K-12: 31st; Higher Ed: 17th	20	14 (tied)
GIS / Transportation	(New category in 2001)	Unranked (> 25th)	21 (tied)
Aggregate Ranking	14th	17th	Unranked (>25th)

The rankings in specific categories reflect the type of questions asked. For example, in 2000, Nebraska ranked 10th in Management/Administration, because it boasted a CIO, a technology commission, and had completed a statewide technology plan. In 2001, the questions focused on whether the CIO had broad authority, whether the technology commission made decisions on projects, and whether a detailed technical architecture was in place. Nebraska's ranking dropped in subsequent years, because we are pursuing a collaborative approach to coordination rather than top-down centralization of all decision-making authority. And, we are still in the early phases of the complex task of defining a technical architecture.

In addition to the survey results above, Nebrask@ Online was a 2001 and 2002 finalist (top 10 designation among states) in the "Best of the Web" competition. The 2001 Digital State Survey also recognized the Department of Health and Human Services' NFOCUS program as a best practice. NFOCUS is unique among states, because it integrates multiple aid programs and provides access to a wide range of private entities that are involved in client intake and services. It is a fully automated eligibility determination and case management system that integrates twenty-five separate benefits programs.

The University of Nebraska achieved "Best of Breed" status with its Virtually Integrated University. The University of Nebraska System has developed, in partnership with supplier Blackboard Corporation, the cornerstone of its computing architecture: the Virtually Integrated University. This new model applies a portal strategy to create an environment that links somewhat independent administrative systems, such as SAP, student information systems, and the data warehouse. It also gives students and faculty the ability through technology to have all University information on one web site.

The Supreme Court's automated court system (JUSTICE), which is in use in all but one of the state's county and district courts, received "Best of Breed" honors in the Digital State Survey in 2002. JUSTICE provides complete functionality for court administration and case management. It also shares data with many other systems in state and local government.

Copies of the Digital State Survey reports are available at: http://www.centerdigitalgov.com/. The "best of breed" reports are available on the NITC web site at: www.nitc.state.ne.us/news/0201. A copy of this report with a detailed analysis by category is available at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/news/0201/SG_nebraska_scorecard.pdf.

Its score in six categories kept Nebraska from ranking in the top 10 for 2002. These include digital democracy, electronic commerce / business regulation, law enforcement / courts, education, and GIS / transportation. Key steps to improve in these categories are summarized below. Part C gives more detailed information about the results, criteria, and best practices for all eight categories.

Digital Democracy. Digital democracy refers to the application of digital technologies to permit Internet access to laws, candidate information and electronic voting technologies. Regaining a top ranking is this category would require the following functionality: Allow citizens to subscribe to bills and receive e-mail update on legislation; improve availability of election information on the Web, and better online access to campaign and lobbyist disclosures.

Current Strategy: Citizen Portal Initiative.

Electronic Commerce / Business Regulation. Moving business-related forms to the Internet for submitting online with electronic payment is key to success. Other areas for improvement include online vehicle registration renewals, using technology to streamline procurement and purchasing, and pursuing intergovernmental projects and practices.

Current Strategy: Governor's Business Portal Initiative; individual agency enhancements.

Law Enforcement / Courts. Key success criteria include digital mobile technologies and a digital communications network for officers. Other criteria for improvement include video conferencing services at all state prisons and providing online access to all court decisions and opinion. Using digital signatures for the justice system and accepting pleadings, motions, and brief filings online are also areas for improvement.

Current Strategy: JUSTICE (court automation system) enhancements; Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) Strategic Plan; individual agency enhancements.

Management / Administration. A major reason for our low ranking in this category is the lack of a technical architecture. Other criteria for improvement include implementing content management, providing live 24x7customer support for the state's portal, and providing the CIO with enterprise wide authority over information technology management and funding. Another benchmark (Governing Magazine's Government Performance Project 2001) also downgraded Nebraska's approach to information technology management for similar reasons. That survey indicated the need to accelerate development of the technical architecture, improve evaluation of proposed systems, and establish evaluation of existing systems after implementation.

Current Strategy: Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC) planning and project management requirements; project review process; technical architecture standards and guidelines.

Education. Doing better in this component would require an integrated approach to distance education programs to coordinate course offerings and schedules and minimizing redundant offerings and implementing a statewide plan for IT professional development in K-12 education.

Current Strategy: Education Portal Initiative; NITC Education Council priorities; individual agency enhancements.

GIS / Transportation. A higher ranking is this category would require developing a GIS clearinghouse to which all departments have access, and standardized protocols exist for making updates to departmental "layers" of mapped data. Other changes would include a fully integrated online GIS repository that is available online to the general public and integrating the state's intelligent transportation system plans into other IT strategic plans.

Current Strategy: GIS Steering Committee Strategic Plan; Department of Roads (DOR) GIS Strategic Plan; DOR Intelligent Transportation System.

Governing Magazine Performance Evaluation

Every two years, Governing Magazine sponsors the Government Performance Project covering five areas of management including financial management, capital management, human resources, managing for results, and information technology. Nebraska scored an average grade of B in 1999 and B- in 2001. Nebraska's grade for information technology management was a C+ in both 1999 and 2001, but dropped significantly relative to other states. In 1999, Governing Magazine ranked 27 states with a grade of C or below. In 2001, only 12 states received a grade of C or below. Nebraska did well in the areas of having a statewide technology plan, sharing data among agencies and across jurisdictions, implementing digital government, and using information technology to support agency functions and programs. Areas for improvement included:

- More centralized authority over information technology decisions (the Governing survey implies a preference for centralized decisions);
- Formal evaluation of proposed hardware and software systems;
- Formal evaluation of information technology systems after implementation;
- A structured process for project management, tracking, and reporting;
- Adopting a comprehensive technical architecture, standards, and guidelines;
- Implementing training.

Security Assessments

In October 2000, KPMG conducted a limited security audit of the state's network. They identified several vulnerabilities stemming from missing or weak security policies and poorly configured servers. Long-term recommendations called for:

- Developing and enforcing security policies and procedures;
- Creating minimum baseline documents for each platform;
- Reviewing and testing device configurations on a regular basis.

The NITC has funded a grant for an external intrusion vulnerability assessment of the state's data network. The Office of the Chief Information Officer will solicit bids in fall of 2002. The assessment will include a vulnerability scan that is designed to mimic how an external party with little or no "inside" information would approach breaching State security measures. Based on the results of the initial phase, selected areas of potential vulnerabilities will be studied in further depth and exploited as far as is reasonable without causing significant disruption of services.

CHARTS Independent Verification and Validation

As part of a federal requirement, the consulting firm of TRW has performed semi-annual reviews of the CHARTS project. Their findings included recommendations for statewide standards in several areas:

- Management standards for large scale and high risk projects;
- Quality Assurance (QA) standards, metrics and tools;
- System development and Configuration Management (CM) process for all state projects.